

EXHIBIT J

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:)	Chapter 11
)	
W.R. GRACE & CO., et al.,)	Case No. 01-01139 (JKF)
)	(Jointly Administered)
Debtors.)	

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

Taken at:

Nordhagen Court Reporting

1734 Harrison Avenue

Butte, Montana

July 29, 2009

8:35 a.m.

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE DEBTOR:</p> <p>4 BRIAN THOMAS STANSBURY</p> <p>5 Attorney at Law</p> <p>6 Kirkland & Ellis LLP</p> <p>7 655 Fifteenth Street, NW</p> <p>8 Washington, D.C. 20005</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 FOR THE LIBBY CLAIMANTS:</p> <p>12 TOM L. LEWIS</p> <p>13 Attorney at Law</p> <p>14 Lewis, Slovak & Kovacich, PC</p> <p>15 P.O. Box 2325</p> <p>16 Great Falls, Montana 59403-2325</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 FOR THE ASBESTOS CLAIMANTS COMMITTEE:</p> <p>20 (Telephonically)</p> <p>21 BERNARD S. BAILOR</p> <p>22 Attorney at Law</p> <p>23 Caplin & Drysdale, Chtd.</p> <p>24 One Thomas Circle, NW</p> <p>25 Washington, DC 20005</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE PI FCR:</p> <p>4 (Telephonically)</p> <p>5 GABRIELLA V. CELLAROSI</p> <p>6 Attorney at Law</p> <p>7 Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC</p> <p>8 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - Suite 1200</p> <p>9 Washington, DC 20006-4604</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 FOR MARYLAND CASUALTY:</p> <p>13 (Telephonically)</p> <p>14 JEFFREY C. WISLER</p> <p>15 Attorney at Law</p> <p>16 Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP</p> <p>17 The Nemours Building</p> <p>18 1107 North Orange Street</p> <p>19 Wilmington, Delaware 19899</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 Also Present:</p> <p>23 MORGAN ROHRHOFFER, Case Assistant</p> <p>24 VIDEOGRAPHER: John Nordhagen</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FOR THE PD FCR:</p> <p>4 (Telephonically)</p> <p>5 ALAN B. RICH</p> <p>6 Attorney at Law</p> <p>7 Alan Rich Law</p> <p>8 Elm Place</p> <p>9 1401 Elm Street, Suite 4620</p> <p>10 Dallas, Texas 75201</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 FOR THE PI FCR:</p> <p>14 (Telephonically)</p> <p>15 KATHLEEN A. ORR</p> <p>16 Attorney at Law</p> <p>17 Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP</p> <p>18 Columbia Center</p> <p>19 1152 15th Street, N.W.</p> <p>20 Washington, DC 20005</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>1 I N D E X</p> <p>2 Witness: Page:</p> <p>3 TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.</p> <p>4 Examination by Mr. Stansbury . . . 8</p> <p>5 Examination by Mr. Lewis 210</p> <p>6 Examination by Mr. Stansbury . . . 214</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 Videotape No. 1 6</p> <p>9 Videotape No. 2 66</p> <p>10 Videotape No. 3 130</p> <p>11 Videotape No. 4 197</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 E X H I B I T S</p> <p>15 NO. PAGE DESCRIPTION</p> <p>16 1 66 May 2008 Curriculum Vitae</p> <p>17 2 67 June 2009 Curriculum Vitae</p> <p>18 3 74 "Trees as reservoirs" - Spear co-author</p> <p>19 4 77 Firewood Harvesting Simulations article</p> <p>20 5 77 Fate of Libby Amphibole Fibers article</p> <p>21 6 87 Spear Expert Report</p> <p>22 7 131 Morbidity/Mortality of Vermiculite Miners</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>1 TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.</p> <p>2 WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 20 09; BUTTE, MONTANA</p> <p>3 - - -</p> <p>4 BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to notice, the</p> <p>5 deposition of Terry M. Spear, Ph.D., was taken at the time</p> <p>6 and place and with the appearances of counsel hereinbefore</p> <p>7 noted before Candice L. Nordhagen, Registered Professional</p> <p>8 Reporter and Notary Public for the State of Montana.</p> <p>9 `</p> <p>10 The following proceedings were had:</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 8:32. We're on the</p> <p>13 record.</p> <p>14 This is the videotaped deposition of Dr. Terry</p> <p>15 Spear, taken by the co-counsel for Debtors and</p> <p>16 Debtors-in-Possession.</p> <p>17 This is Case No. 01-01139 (JFK); In re: W.R.</p> <p>18 GRACE & CO., et al., Debtors.</p> <p>19 This deposition is being taken on July 29,</p> <p>20 2009, at Nordhagen Court Reporting; 1734 Harrison Avenue;</p> <p>21 Butte, Montana.</p> <p>22 The court reporter is Candi Nordhagen.</p> <p>23 The videographer is John Nordhagen.</p> <p>24 Counsel will now introduce themselves, after</p> <p>25 which the court reporter will swear in the witness.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>1 EXAMINATION</p> <p>2 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>3 Q. Good morning.</p> <p>4 A. Good morning.</p> <p>5 Q. Would you please introduce yourself for the</p> <p>6 record.</p> <p>7 A. My name is Terry Spear.</p> <p>8 Q. My name is Brian Stansbury and I represent</p> <p>9 W.R. Grace in this bankruptcy proceeding.</p> <p>10 You are a doctor, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. What is your degree in?</p> <p>13 A. Industrial hygiene.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And where do you currently work?</p> <p>15 A. At Montana Tech of the University of Montana.</p> <p>16 Q. Now, Dr. Spear, you've had your deposition</p> <p>17 taken before, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. About how many times?</p> <p>20 A. I don't know. Quite a few; I don't have that</p> <p>21 number.</p> <p>22 Q. More than 30?</p> <p>23 A. Probably.</p> <p>24 Q. Less than a hundred?</p> <p>25 A. Probably.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>1 MR. STANSBURY: Brian Stansbury of Kirkland &</p> <p>2 Ellis for W.R. Grace.</p> <p>3 MR. LEWIS: Tom Lewis, for the Libby</p> <p>4 claimants.</p> <p>5 Anybody on line?</p> <p>6 MR. BAYLOR: Okay. Bernard Baylor, for the</p> <p>7 Asbestos Claimants Committee.</p> <p>8 MR. RICH: Alan Rich is on the line for the</p> <p>9 Property Damage FCR. And if you take down my e-mail, I</p> <p>10 will e-mail you back my full contact information.</p> <p>11 It's Alan, A-L-A-N @ alanrich - R-I-C-H - law</p> <p>12 - L-A-W - dotcom.</p> <p>13 MS. ORR: This is Kate Orr for the Personal</p> <p>14 Injury FCR.</p> <p>15 MS. CELLAROSI: Gabriella Cellarosi for</p> <p>16 Maryland Casualty.</p> <p>17 MR. STANSBURY: Anybody --</p> <p>18 MR. WISLER: Jeffrey Wisler, for Maryland</p> <p>19 Casualty.</p> <p>20 MR. STANSBURY: Anybody else? Going once.</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.,</p> <p>23 having been called as a witness by the</p> <p>24 Debtor, being first duly sworn, was</p> <p>25 examined and testified as follows:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>1 Q. Somewhere in the 50-or-so range?</p> <p>2 A. I would guess.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So you're familiar with the process,</p> <p>4 then.</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. All right. I'm just going to go over a couple</p> <p>7 issues. And if you have any questions, just let me know.</p> <p>8 First, I would ask that when responding, you do so in a</p> <p>9 "yes", "no", or audible manner, as opposed to nodding your</p> <p>10 head or saying "um-hmm", just so we keep the record clean.</p> <p>11 Is that fair?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Also, I will strive at all times not to speak</p> <p>14 over you; and hopefully, we can avoid you speaking over</p> <p>15 me, again, for the benefit of the court reporter to keep</p> <p>16 the record clear. Is that fair?</p> <p>17 A. That's fair.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Are you under any medication today that</p> <p>19 would inhibit your ability to answer questions truthfully,</p> <p>20 honestly, and completely?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And unless stated otherwise, I'm going</p> <p>23 to presume that you understood my questions. If at any</p> <p>24 point I ask a question that for whatever reason you don't</p> <p>25 understand, please let me know so I can rephrase it or we</p>

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 can ensure that we're on the same page. Is that fair?</p> <p>2 A. That's fair.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. You say you're at Montana Tech at the</p> <p>4 University of Montana?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And what is your title?</p> <p>7 A. My title is professor and department head.</p> <p>8 Q. And that's the -- what is the actual, what is</p> <p>9 the department?</p> <p>10 A. The department is the Safety, Health and</p> <p>11 Industrial Hygiene Department.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And how long have you worked there?</p> <p>13 A. I have been at Montana Tech for 26 years, I</p> <p>14 think.</p> <p>15 Q. Uninterrupted?</p> <p>16 A. For the most part. Yeah, I haven't had any</p> <p>17 other employment with other companies.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. What is your educational background?</p> <p>19 A. My, from -- well, my educational background is</p> <p>20 a bachelor's degree in microbiology from the University of</p> <p>21 Montana.</p> <p>22 Q. Is that in Missoula?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. And then a master's of science degree in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 small particle technology.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. I think those are the main ones.</p> <p>4 Q. Let me just, let me unpack this a bit just so</p> <p>5 I'm clear. We're in the summer right now. So let's say</p> <p>6 last spring, which courses did you teach?</p> <p>7 A. Last spring I taught respiratory protection</p> <p>8 and I believe it was sampling strategies.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Let's talk about respiratory</p> <p>10 protection. Could you briefly describe what that class</p> <p>11 entails?</p> <p>12 A. It entails providing -- teaching the students</p> <p>13 how to develop a respiratory protection program, going</p> <p>14 through the different types of respirators, fit testing of</p> <p>15 workers who have to wear respirators, training in</p> <p>16 respiratory protection.</p> <p>17 Q. And in the course of that class, is there any</p> <p>18 point in that class when you deal with, for example,</p> <p>19 asbestos in particular?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. How prevalent was that, was asbestos, in the</p> <p>22 discussion in your class?</p> <p>23 A. Well, since I do a lot of work in asbestos, I</p> <p>24 make sure that I cover the topic with the students. And I</p> <p>25 mean it certainly isn't the focus of the class, but we</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 industrial hygiene from the University of Minnesota, and</p> <p>2 then a Ph.D. in industrial hygiene from the University of</p> <p>3 Minnesota.</p> <p>4 Q. When did you get your Ph.D. from the</p> <p>5 University of Minnesota?</p> <p>6 A. It was awarded in 1996, I believe.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And was that -- were you still working</p> <p>8 at Montana Tech at the time?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Were you alternating between going to classes</p> <p>11 at the University of Minnesota and coming back to Montana</p> <p>12 Tech, or what was the arrangement?</p> <p>13 A. I did take a leave of absence, I believe it</p> <p>14 was in the late '80s, and went back to Minnesota and took</p> <p>15 classes. And then I -- there were other trips back and</p> <p>16 forth to Minnesota from Montana Tech, not any extended</p> <p>17 trips, but basically traveled back and forth to do</p> <p>18 examinations and such.</p> <p>19 Q. Now, at Montana Tech, are you teaching courses</p> <p>20 right now?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. What courses do you teach?</p> <p>23 A. Oh, I, over the years, I've taught many</p> <p>24 different courses. Now I primarily teach courses in</p> <p>25 respiratory protection, courses in sampling strategy,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 talk about respiratory protection where asbestos is</p> <p>2 concerned.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And you said "tree samplings"? Was</p> <p>4 that the other --</p> <p>5 A. Pardon me?</p> <p>6 Q. What was the other course you said?</p> <p>7 A. Sampling strategies.</p> <p>8 Q. Oh, sampling strategies, I'm sorry, I</p> <p>9 misunderstood. Sampling strategies, and what is that?</p> <p>10 A. That's a course involving designing sampling</p> <p>11 strategies for contaminants in the workplace.</p> <p>12 Q. And by that, you mean, for example, taking air</p> <p>13 samples?</p> <p>14 A. Well, yeah. It's not an instrument course.</p> <p>15 You know, that's covered in the sampling course, a</p> <p>16 different course. But it's mainly how do we assure that</p> <p>17 we're collecting representative samples, defining exposure</p> <p>18 groups, and things pertaining to that.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you teach graduate or undergraduate</p> <p>20 students?</p> <p>21 A. Those two classes are graduate classes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Now, other than your coursework at</p> <p>23 Montana Tech, what other work have you done in the past</p> <p>24 ten years related to asbestos in particular?</p> <p>25 A. Other than -- what was the first part of your</p>

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 question?</p> <p>2 Q. Teaching at Montana Tech. You mentioned</p> <p>3 respiratory protection, a course which, you know, relates</p> <p>4 to asbestos exposure. Other than -- and I guess what I'm</p> <p>5 really trying to get to is: Beyond your role as an</p> <p>6 educator, what work have you done in the last ten years</p> <p>7 related to asbestos?</p> <p>8 A. Well, we've been doing research pertaining to</p> <p>9 asbestos for longer than ten years, since about 2003;</p> <p>10 consulting work pertaining to asbestos.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Now, let's look at the -- if I read --</p> <p>12 it would be research work and consulting work. Let's</p> <p>13 start with the research work. Now, what research projects</p> <p>14 have you worked on related to asbestos?</p> <p>15 A. The research has involved evaluating asbestos</p> <p>16 exposure pathways associated with the amphibole asbestos</p> <p>17 in Libby, and then also doing research pertaining to</p> <p>18 vermiculite or other asbestos-containing materials within</p> <p>19 homes.</p> <p>20 Q. And by vermiculite in homes, are you referring</p> <p>21 to vermiculite attic insulation?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Any other type of vermiculite product in the</p> <p>24 home that was studied?</p> <p>25 A. No, it was primarily vermiculite attic</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 of describing that?</p> <p>2 A. That would be fair.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Any other pathways other than asbestos</p> <p>4 traveling in the ambient air and people kicking up dust</p> <p>5 around the mine site?</p> <p>6 A. Well, and the transportation of it; the</p> <p>7 loading of it and the transportation of it.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So ambient air, we'll call it "activity</p> <p>9 that unsettles settled dust." Is that a fair way of</p> <p>10 describing that?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And then you said the transportation of</p> <p>13 it?</p> <p>14 A. Yeah, loading and transportation of it, I</p> <p>15 believe is what I said.</p> <p>16 Q. And would that refer to loading and</p> <p>17 transportation involving rail lines?</p> <p>18 A. Well, rail lines or other types of loading,</p> <p>19 truck loading and things like that, I guess.</p> <p>20 Q. Where was the truck loading occurring?</p> <p>21 A. Well, just basically from the mine and then</p> <p>22 being transferred down to different points along the</p> <p>23 highway and then unloading by truck. And so I'm just</p> <p>24 trying to cover all the different aspects of how they</p> <p>25 would load it.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 insulation -- or is primarily vermiculite attic</p> <p>2 insulation; wall, some wall insulation.</p> <p>3 Q. Oh, vermiculite attic insulation that was put</p> <p>4 in the walls. Is that what --</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. So the asbestos pathways in Libby,</p> <p>7 which pathways have you studied?</p> <p>8 A. We've been looking primarily at the dispersion</p> <p>9 of asbestos from the mine site into the forest beyond</p> <p>10 Libby and into the town of Libby and along transportation</p> <p>11 corridors.</p> <p>12 Q. Now, is that dispersion in any way ongoing or</p> <p>13 is it simply studying historical dispersion?</p> <p>14 A. Well, we believe that there's evidence that</p> <p>15 it's ongoing, but is what we're doing is basically</p> <p>16 evaluating, trying to determine the boundaries of this</p> <p>17 contamination, so it's not always easy to tell if it's</p> <p>18 historical or current.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And so the dispersion of the asbestos</p> <p>20 from the site in the ambient air? Is that --</p> <p>21 A. Well, that was one way it was dispersed was</p> <p>22 ambient air, and I'm sure it was dispersed through</p> <p>23 movement by machines and road dust and things like that.</p> <p>24 Q. So that would be human activity in the mine</p> <p>25 site and surrounding area kicking up dust. Is that a way</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So transportation loading and</p> <p>2 unloading, is that a fair way of describing the third</p> <p>3 pathway?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Any other pathway for potential</p> <p>6 exposure in the communities, let's say, in Libby that</p> <p>7 you've studied?</p> <p>8 A. Not currently, we haven't.</p> <p>9 Q. What about historically?</p> <p>10 A. Well, no, none of the research has involved --</p> <p>11 that research has not involved any in-house types of</p> <p>12 sampling. The vermiculite research has.</p> <p>13 Q. Oh, and that would be -- okay, I understand</p> <p>14 what you're saying. So when you refer to vermiculite,</p> <p>15 this is what we were speaking of earlier, which was the</p> <p>16 Zonolite attic insulation that was in attics and also was</p> <p>17 in, in some cases, the walls of homes, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So we can just make that the fourth</p> <p>20 item on the list where we have asbestos traveling from the</p> <p>21 mine site from the ambient air; asbestos kicked up around</p> <p>22 the mine site by human activity; transportation, which</p> <p>23 includes loading and unloading of vermiculite; and then</p> <p>24 Zonolite attic insulation in homes. Are there any other</p> <p>25 pathways of exposure besides those four that you have</p>

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>1 studied?</p> <p>2 A. That I have studied, no.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Are there any other pathways other than</p> <p>4 those four that you are aware of?</p> <p>5 A. Well, I think there's, again, there's a lot of</p> <p>6 activity that go on in homes that could stir up asbestos</p> <p>7 dust there and create exposures.</p> <p>8 Q. From Zonolite attic insulation or from some</p> <p>9 other source?</p> <p>10 A. Well, it could be from attic insulation or it</p> <p>11 could be from other sources that made their way into the</p> <p>12 home.</p> <p>13 Q. Are you aware of any other sources?</p> <p>14 A. Well, windblown dust.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So that would be, again, kind of under</p> <p>16 the first heading which would be asbestos that's blown</p> <p>17 from the air, blown through the air from the mine site.</p> <p>18 Is that what you're referring to there?</p> <p>19 A. That would be one method, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. And then transport just by human activity,</p> <p>22 carrying it in on your clothes or your feet.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And so this research that you've done,</p> <p>24 on whose behalf was it performed?</p> <p>25 A. The research that we began in 2003 was, was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So let me write that down real quick.</p> <p>2 The University of the Utah, the harvesting study. And was</p> <p>3 that the study that was published in 2007?</p> <p>4 A. I believe so.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, okay. What other studies -- what other</p> <p>6 sources of funding were involved with other studies that</p> <p>7 you've published?</p> <p>8 A. Well, the Forest Service is funding the</p> <p>9 studies we're doing for them.</p> <p>10 Q. And which study is that?</p> <p>11 A. The occupational exposure of Forest Service</p> <p>12 workers.</p> <p>13 Q. And have the findings of that study been</p> <p>14 published in a paper?</p> <p>15 A. Not yet.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. The work you've done for the Forest</p> <p>17 Service, is it in any way bearing on your opinions in this</p> <p>18 case?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Is it something that you have produced, these</p> <p>21 findings that you have? Have you taken samples?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. When did you take these samples?</p> <p>24 A. I believe it was -- we did the initial Forest</p> <p>25 Service sampling or study last summer, not this summer but</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>1 funded through a COBRE Grant, the University of Montana.</p> <p>2 Q. And which, so I'm clear, which was the 2003</p> <p>3 research?</p> <p>4 A. That's doing the Libby work.</p> <p>5 Q. So all those, all four categories you were</p> <p>6 speaking of earlier, all that's been funded by a grant</p> <p>7 through the University of Montana that was issued in 2003?</p> <p>8 A. Well, in part.</p> <p>9 Q. In part.</p> <p>10 A. It began with funding from COBRE, the</p> <p>11 University of Montana, and then there was some funding</p> <p>12 provided from the University of Utah to do some later work</p> <p>13 in the more recent years.</p> <p>14 Q. And which work was that, the more recent work</p> <p>15 in later years you mentioned?</p> <p>16 A. We've been working with the Forest Service to</p> <p>17 determine potential occupational exposure within their</p> <p>18 jobs within the forest around the mine.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And this work was what was ultimately</p> <p>20 published in a series of papers, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes. In fact, let me correct myself a little</p> <p>22 bit here.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 A. The University of Utah funded the initial</p> <p>25 firewood harvesting simulation study.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">21</p> <p>1 last summer.</p> <p>2 Q. And this is in Lincoln County?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. How many samples did you take?</p> <p>5 A. Boy, that's a -- we do a series of air</p> <p>6 sampling, personal air sampling; and then we also do wipe</p> <p>7 sampling of Tyvek clothing they were wearing for</p> <p>8 protection.</p> <p>9 Q. And personal air sampling, is that often</p> <p>10 abbreviated PBZ?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And that's "personal breathing zone";</p> <p>13 is that right?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So you do personal breathing zone</p> <p>16 sampling. And then you said "wipe sampling"?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. What is wipe sampling?</p> <p>19 A. Wipe sampling is wiping a surface or a garment</p> <p>20 with, basically, an alcohol wipe to remove dust or</p> <p>21 asbestos.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So you have done both personal</p> <p>23 breathing zone sampling and wipe sampling for the Forest</p> <p>24 Service. And this was, I believe you said, the summer</p> <p>25 2008, correct?</p>

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>1 A. I believe that's when we did it.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have an estimate of how many samples</p> <p>3 you took?</p> <p>4 A. Well, I would say the air samples, I would</p> <p>5 estimate that we took -- I don't know if it was in the</p> <p>6 range of 50 samples.</p> <p>7 Q. And what about the wipe samples?</p> <p>8 A. Well, the wipe samples, we used composite</p> <p>9 wipes. So if you count individual wipes, there were</p> <p>10 probably maybe 60 or 70 wipe samples. I don't remember</p> <p>11 the exact numbers.</p> <p>12 Q. And this work that you've done for the Forest</p> <p>13 Service, just so I'm clear, this is not the work that was</p> <p>14 published in the recent publications that you have</p> <p>15 authored related to your work in Libby, correct?</p> <p>16 A. It has not been published yet.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay, not yet. So it's not available to the</p> <p>18 public, then, correct?</p> <p>19 A. That would be correct.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. However, you say this does inform your</p> <p>21 opinion about potential exposures in Libby?</p> <p>22 A. In and around Libby, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. How so?</p> <p>24 A. Well --</p> <p>25 MR. LEWIS: Well, wait now. I want to object.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 correct?</p> <p>2 A. I'm sorry, what would impact?</p> <p>3 Q. The findings of your work for the forestry</p> <p>4 department. The work you've done for the forestry</p> <p>5 department and the samples taken and your analysis of</p> <p>6 those samples informs your opinion about potential</p> <p>7 exposure somebody would have in the forest around Libby,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Well, in terms of Forest Service employees,</p> <p>10 yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And what are Forest Service employees,</p> <p>12 just so I'm clear?</p> <p>13 A. Well, these are people that work for the</p> <p>14 Forest Service and do work that the Forest Service</p> <p>15 requires them to do.</p> <p>16 Q. And what is that? What kind of work is that?</p> <p>17 A. Well, they do trail maintenance, and they do</p> <p>18 tree measurement, and they evaluate forests for forest</p> <p>19 health, and they have test plots where they evaluate tree</p> <p>20 growth. And that's part of what they do.</p> <p>21 Q. What kind of -- and so when you did --</p> <p>22 A. They fight forest fires.</p> <p>23 Q. So when you did this study, you simulated</p> <p>24 activities, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 He hasn't said that it forms his opinions in this case.</p> <p>2 It's not a completed study. He hasn't reached final</p> <p>3 opinions. Okay? And it informs his opinions generally,</p> <p>4 but he's not testifying it informs his opinions in this</p> <p>5 case.</p> <p>6 MR. STANSBURY: I will ask going forward you</p> <p>7 not coach the witness through your objections.</p> <p>8 You may answer the question.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Well, yeah, all of the work that</p> <p>10 we do in Libby informs me generally as to the, you know,</p> <p>11 the dispersal of the asbestos in and around Libby.</p> <p>12 Obviously, this work hasn't been published. We haven't</p> <p>13 even finalized the results for the Forest Service</p> <p>14 occupational study, so -- (pause.)</p> <p>15 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) But you are aware of the</p> <p>16 results, correct?</p> <p>17 A. I'm aware of results.</p> <p>18 Q. And that is something which impacts your</p> <p>19 understanding of potential exposures in and around Libby,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. Well, this focused on the Forest Service</p> <p>22 occupational study, so it's a narrow -- much narrower than</p> <p>23 the bark studies. Let's put it that way.</p> <p>24 Q. But it would still impact, let's say, forest</p> <p>25 workers working in the forest in and around Libby,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: Objection; that's not what he's</p> <p>2 testified to so far.</p> <p>3 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) I believe your answer to</p> <p>4 the question was "yes"?</p> <p>5 A. For the Forest Service, we simulated the</p> <p>6 activities that they would perform.</p> <p>7 Q. And which activities were those? Just so I'm</p> <p>8 -- you mentioned some activities earlier, but just so I'm</p> <p>9 clear, which activities did you simulate?</p> <p>10 A. We simulated trail maintenance when they're</p> <p>11 clearing trails.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay.</p> <p>13 A. We simulated tree measurement.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 A. We simulated walking through the forest if</p> <p>16 they were walking to get to a stand of trees to evaluate.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Anything else?</p> <p>18 A. And we simulated fire line construction.</p> <p>19 Q. What is fire line construction?</p> <p>20 A. If there's a forest fire, and it's the</p> <p>21 constructing of a fire line around the fire.</p> <p>22 Q. How is that constructed? Is it made of --</p> <p>23 what is it made of?</p> <p>24 A. It's done with hand tools.</p> <p>25 Q. Hand tools. And where, generally, did you</p>

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>1 conduct these simulations?</p> <p>2 A. The area was probably - let's see if I can get</p> <p>3 my directions right - probably northeast of where the mine</p> <p>4 site was outside of the restricted zone of the mine, and</p> <p>5 essentially between the mine and Lake Koocanusa.</p> <p>6 Q. We might need some help with spelling on that</p> <p>7 one later on.</p> <p>8 Any other research other than what we've discussed</p> <p>9 this morning? Any other asbestos-related research?</p> <p>10 Let me rephrase this: Have you conducted any other</p> <p>11 asbestos-related research other than what we've discussed</p> <p>12 so far this morning?</p> <p>13 A. Let me think for just a second. I don't</p> <p>14 believe so.</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Counsel, I'm not going to coach</p> <p>16 the witness, but I, but I don't know if you intended by</p> <p>17 "research" formal research projects or background research</p> <p>18 many years ago. From the witness's answer, I'm not sure</p> <p>19 he understood the question.</p> <p>20 MR. STANSBURY: That would be coaching the</p> <p>21 witness.</p> <p>22 MR. LEWIS: No, it is not coaching the witness</p> <p>23 sir. I'm trying to clarify the record here. Your</p> <p>24 question was broad. And what do you mean?</p> <p>25 I'll make a formal objection. The question is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>1 you done?</p> <p>2 A. Just literature reviews to, in my own mind,</p> <p>3 understand the knowledge of asbestos and the hazard of</p> <p>4 asbestos over time, and how companies were dealing with</p> <p>5 these issues, and things like that.</p> <p>6 Q. When did you first conduct - and I'm going to</p> <p>7 use the term "comprehensive", and if you have any</p> <p>8 question, please feel free to -- I'm happy to clarify.</p> <p>9 When did you first conduct a comprehensive review of</p> <p>10 asbestos literature?</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: Object to the form of the question</p> <p>12 on the grounds that it's compound and unintelligible as</p> <p>13 stated.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mean what you consider</p> <p>15 comprehensive, I may not.</p> <p>16 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Okay.</p> <p>17 A. I mean to me, that's a confusing word.</p> <p>18 Q. And let's get that, let's figure that out.</p> <p>19 When did you first review any article related to</p> <p>20 asbestos?</p> <p>21 A. Well, probably back in 1978.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Do you remember what that was?</p> <p>23 A. I don't remember what it was.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. When did you first decide to seek out</p> <p>25 asbestos literature specifically for purposes of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>1 vague because it refers to "other research" without</p> <p>2 defining what you mean by "other research"; and therefore,</p> <p>3 it's an improper question.</p> <p>4 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Dr. Spear, is there any</p> <p>5 other research that you conducted related to asbestos</p> <p>6 other than what we've discussed this morning?</p> <p>7 A. Well, the understanding of our questioning</p> <p>8 along those regard is that you were asking about research</p> <p>9 that we were performing in Libby to collect data and</p> <p>10 publish results.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay, then let's clarify this. And again, to</p> <p>12 the extent that you ever misinterpret or are concerned you</p> <p>13 may be, please feel free to raise it.</p> <p>14 Other than Libby, is there any other research</p> <p>15 related to asbestos generally that you've performed?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I performed literature research of</p> <p>17 asbestos.</p> <p>18 Q. And what is literature research? Does that</p> <p>19 mean reviewing literature?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. But that's not, for example, taking</p> <p>22 samples and analyzing the samples and reaching conclusions</p> <p>23 based on the sampling, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. What type of literature reviews have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">29</p> <p>1 researching and broadening your understanding of asbestos</p> <p>2 literature?</p> <p>3 A. Probably in 1979.</p> <p>4 Q. And what was the reason for doing that?</p> <p>5 A. Because I was working at a copper smelter in</p> <p>6 Anaconda, and we certainly had asbestos-containing</p> <p>7 materials there. And we had issues that I had to look up</p> <p>8 pertaining to asbestos.</p> <p>9 Q. What kind of articles did you read?</p> <p>10 A. Well, at that time, I'm sure I read the OSHA</p> <p>11 and the NIOSH publications, and some of the textbooks or</p> <p>12 National Safety Council information; Patty's Industrial</p> <p>13 Hygiene and Toxicology, things like that, that provided</p> <p>14 information on asbestos.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you survey epidemiological literature?</p> <p>16 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>17 Q. Did you read epidemiological literature?</p> <p>18 A. I'm sure I did.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Do you recall any studies that you</p> <p>20 reviewed in 1979?</p> <p>21 A. No. I'm sure I saw the Doll study in 1979. I</p> <p>22 don't specifically recall all the articles I looked at in</p> <p>23 1979, I'm sorry.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Did you continue -- well, let me</p> <p>25 rephrase that. Do you have any idea of how many articles</p>

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>1 you reviewed in 1979?</p> <p>2 A. I don't have. I don't. I can't give you a</p> <p>3 number. I mean it's many years ago and I don't remember</p> <p>4 the articles I looked up.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Did you stay current with the asbestos</p> <p>6 literature after 1979?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. What publications would you review on an</p> <p>9 ongoing basis after 1979?</p> <p>10 A. Well, the publications in the American</p> <p>11 Industrial Hygiene Association Journal and the American</p> <p>12 Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygiene Association</p> <p>13 Journal.</p> <p>14 Q. So those are both, as the title would imply,</p> <p>15 publications aimed at industrial hygiene issues, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Well, yes, I believe that would be correct,</p> <p>17 then.</p> <p>18 Q. So they would look at things such as exposure</p> <p>19 levels, sampling methods, issues like that, correct?</p> <p>20 MR. LEWIS: Objection; that's a compound</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 But you can answer, Doctor.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Well, yeah, I mean it could</p> <p>24 cover many different aspects. I mean there were -- you</p> <p>25 know, they would talk about protecting workers through</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 A. Well, yeah, I'm not a medical doctor. I</p> <p>3 certainly read medical literature and toxicological</p> <p>4 literature. I'm not a toxicologist, I mean, but it all</p> <p>5 informs me concerning the subject matter of asbestos.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Well, let's, I guess, then, kind of go</p> <p>7 through some of the areas where you -- well, some of your</p> <p>8 qualifications, so to speak, with respect to different</p> <p>9 aspects of asbestos disease.</p> <p>10 MR. LEWIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>11 question.</p> <p>12 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) You mentioned that you have</p> <p>13 no medical training, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And that would include no training in</p> <p>16 radiology, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Correct.</p> <p>18 Q. No training in pulmonary medicine generally,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you have any experience obtaining exposure</p> <p>22 histories from a patient?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. And so, of course, you're not able to diagnose</p> <p>25 patients with asbestos-related disease, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>1 sanitation, and clothing, and showers, and things like</p> <p>2 that. Sure, I mean it would cover not only sampling and</p> <p>3 standards, but how do we control the exposures.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Do these articles --</p> <p>5 A. The Annals of Occupational Hygiene, obviously,</p> <p>6 too, is another one that was -- that I considered to be</p> <p>7 important even back in the late '70s.</p> <p>8 Q. But would these publications contain mortality</p> <p>9 studies of cohorts exposed to asbestos?</p> <p>10 A. They could provide summaries of those types of</p> <p>11 studies.</p> <p>12 Q. But that would not be the central focus of</p> <p>13 these articles?</p> <p>14 A. Well, I'm not sure. I mean the -- certainly,</p> <p>15 a lot of the textbooks and the articles that you're</p> <p>16 referring to discussed mortality and rates of death from</p> <p>17 asbestos exposure.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. What about pulmonary function testing?</p> <p>19 Was that an area of asbestos medicine that you stayed</p> <p>20 current on during this time period?</p> <p>21 A. Not really.</p> <p>22 MR. LEWIS: Objection. This witness is not a</p> <p>23 medical doctor. He's not qualified to testify as to</p> <p>24 pulmonary studies.</p> <p>25 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) You may answer the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have an opinion on whether there is a</p> <p>3 distinction between individuals who have developed an</p> <p>4 asbestos disease from exposures in Libby, Montana, as</p> <p>5 opposed to individuals who have developed an asbestos</p> <p>6 disease from exposures outside of Libby, Montana?</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: Could the court reporter read back</p> <p>8 the question? It's a long question and I'm not sure I</p> <p>9 understand it.</p> <p>10 (The pending question was read by the court</p> <p>11 reporter.)</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: Okay. I'm going to object to the</p> <p>13 form of the question on -- it's vague. The word</p> <p>14 "distinction", I don't know what you mean by that.</p> <p>15 Perhaps the witness does, and I'm not going to coach him</p> <p>16 or interfere with his answer, but the question is vague</p> <p>17 and overbroad.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I had, you know, I had two</p> <p>19 questions pertaining to the question. And --</p> <p>20 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>21 Q. Sure. What were your questions?</p> <p>22 A. What do you mean by, yeah, the distinction</p> <p>23 between individuals? Are we talking about male versus</p> <p>24 female?</p> <p>25 Q. Okay.</p>

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">34</p> <p>1 A. And then the second question is: When you say</p> <p>2 exposure outside of Libby, are we talking about exposure</p> <p>3 to asbestos, or different types of asbestos, or what are</p> <p>4 we talking about?</p> <p>5 Q. Good, and I appreciate you asking me about</p> <p>6 that, any questions you have.</p> <p>7 Obviously, you're aware that people who are exposed</p> <p>8 to asbestos may develop disease, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And people in Libby have been exposed to</p> <p>11 asbestos from Libby and developed disease, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. And people, let's say, in Pascagoula,</p> <p>14 Mississippi, have been exposed to asbestos and developed</p> <p>15 disease from those exposures, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Often asbestos that had nothing to do with</p> <p>18 Libby, Montana, correct?</p> <p>19 A. That could be correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And those, you know, just from your general</p> <p>21 review of the medical literature, you are aware that these</p> <p>22 diseases fall into -- there are different types of</p> <p>23 diseases associated with asbestos exposure, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Mesothelioma, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>1 asbestos.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So let's unpack that. So the answer to</p> <p>3 my question would be you do have an opinion, and your</p> <p>4 opinion relates not to mesothelioma or lung cancer, per</p> <p>5 say. The opinion you stated relates to that non-malignant</p> <p>6 disease, correct?</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: Objection. He didn't testify to</p> <p>8 everything you asked him to assume by that question, if</p> <p>9 that is a hypothetical question, and the question is</p> <p>10 compound.</p> <p>11 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) You may answer.</p> <p>12 A. What I referred to was the pulmonary fibrosis.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Which is a non-malignant disease,</p> <p>14 correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you have an opinion as to any difference</p> <p>17 involving lung cancer or mesothelioma?</p> <p>18 A. Well, I testified in previous depositions</p> <p>19 regarding Libby that there are certainly some medical</p> <p>20 literature that is saying that the tremolite - in that</p> <p>21 case they were talking about tremolite, not Libby</p> <p>22 amphibole - is a long, thin fiber, and it has been shown</p> <p>23 to be a very potent mesothelioma causer.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. So you do have an opinion regarding</p> <p>25 Libby disease -- strike that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Lung cancer?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And there are also various forms of</p> <p>5 non-malignant asbestos-related diseases, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And that could include asbestosis, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Fibrosis of the pleura, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And do you have any opinion as to how any of</p> <p>12 those diseases would manifest themselves differently in a</p> <p>13 person whose exposure was to asbestos in Libby as opposed</p> <p>14 to a person who was exposed to a different type of</p> <p>15 asbestos outside of Libby?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. You have an opinion?</p> <p>18 A. Based on my review of the Libby work and the</p> <p>19 medical literature.</p> <p>20 Q. What is that opinion?</p> <p>21 A. My opinion is that the asbestos, the amphibole</p> <p>22 asbestos in Libby seems to be causing a very severe</p> <p>23 pulmonary fibrosis which is progressive and fast-acting</p> <p>24 and can lead to death, which is different than what's been</p> <p>25 seen in other cohorts exposed to different types of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>1 You do have an opinion with respect to mesothelioma.</p> <p>2 What about lung cancer? Do you have an opinion about how</p> <p>3 a person exposed to asbestos in Libby as opposed to a</p> <p>4 person exposed to a different type of asbestos elsewhere</p> <p>5 may develop lung cancer?</p> <p>6 A. Well, I think all forms of asbestos can cause</p> <p>7 lung cancer.</p> <p>8 Q. But you don't have an opinion as to whether</p> <p>9 Libby asbestos has a greater likelihood of causing lung</p> <p>10 cancer as opposed to another form of asbestos?</p> <p>11 A. I don't really have an opinion on that.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So let's talk about your mesothelioma</p> <p>13 and your pulmonary fibrosis opinions. Let's start with</p> <p>14 the pulmonary fibrosis. And what type of pulmonary</p> <p>15 fibrosis are you talking about? Are you talking</p> <p>16 interstitial disease or are you talking about pleural</p> <p>17 disease?</p> <p>18 A. Pleural.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion as to how</p> <p>20 exposure to Libby tremolite affects interstitial disease</p> <p>21 compared to the way other forms of asbestos cause</p> <p>22 interstitial disease?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I don't. I can't comment on medical</p> <p>24 diagnosis or medical findings. All I'm saying is I draw</p> <p>25 my opinion or I form my opinion based on what I'm reading</p>

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 in the medical literature.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So from what you're reading in the</p> <p>3 medical literature, can you identify any piece of</p> <p>4 literature that would support an opinion that exposure to</p> <p>5 Libby asbestos would have a greater likelihood of causing</p> <p>6 interstitial disease as opposed to other forms of</p> <p>7 asbestos?</p> <p>8 A. I don't.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. But you do have that opinion with</p> <p>10 respect to pleural disease, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So let's focus, then, on pleural</p> <p>13 disease. Now -- and maybe I should take one quick step</p> <p>14 back. When we're talking about asbestos from Libby, what</p> <p>15 is the asbestos from Libby?</p> <p>16 A. Asbestos from Libby is a mixture of</p> <p>17 amphiboles.</p> <p>18 Q. Which amphiboles?</p> <p>19 A. Well, it's what's been identified as winchite</p> <p>20 and richterite and tremolite, and then another one that I</p> <p>21 can't pronounce, riebeckite, or some long name that I</p> <p>22 don't even try to pronounce.</p> <p>23 Q. Now, are there any difference -- what are the</p> <p>24 differences between winchite and tremolite?</p> <p>25 A. Well, my -- I'm not a mineralogist, either,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>1 Q. And you, you rely on Meeker, don't you, in</p> <p>2 your expert report?</p> <p>3 A. Well, I rely on his mineralogy expertise, I</p> <p>4 guess, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, okay. So when we're talking about Libby</p> <p>6 amphibole, we're talking about a mix of these four</p> <p>7 amphiboles, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And so if I use the term "Libby</p> <p>10 amphibole," you understand I'm referring to the four</p> <p>11 amphiboles found in Libby, Montana, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. So let's go back to the pleural</p> <p>14 disease. What is your opinion about any differences in</p> <p>15 the way pleural disease has manifested itself in people</p> <p>16 exposed to the Libby amphibole?</p> <p>17 A. Well, again, I'm not a toxicologist or a</p> <p>18 medical doctor, but these are amphiboles. We know that</p> <p>19 amphiboles, in general, are toxic and cause severe lung</p> <p>20 disease. And so now we have a combination of amphiboles,</p> <p>21 and so, obviously, it's going to be toxic. And my opinion</p> <p>22 basically comes from talking to the doctors in, in Libby.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And you kind of led me to where I</p> <p>24 wanted to go, because your opinions are not based on your</p> <p>25 training as an industrial hygienist, correct? Your</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>1 but my understanding is that they're in the same mineral</p> <p>2 family, but there's differences in, I think, sodium and</p> <p>3 potassium for one. But again, I'm not a mineralogist.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. The same question with respect to</p> <p>5 richterite. Are you available -- are you aware of any</p> <p>6 differences between richterite and tremolite?</p> <p>7 A. Well, again, the same mineral family, to my</p> <p>8 knowledge.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. The majority of the amphibole in Libby</p> <p>10 is winchite, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. In fact, based on what's in the literature,</p> <p>13 often tremolite would be as low as 6 percent of the</p> <p>14 amphibole material in the ore from Libby, correct?</p> <p>15 A. It could be.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. It could be higher, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. But in some cases, over 80 percent was</p> <p>19 winchite, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say winchite is the</p> <p>22 predominant amphibole in the Libby amphibole?</p> <p>23 A. According to Meeker, I believe that would be</p> <p>24 his assumptions, that it's mostly winchite, followed by</p> <p>25 richterite, followed by tremolite.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 opinions -- let me rephrase that.</p> <p>2 Your opinions about pleural disease in Libby are not</p> <p>3 based on your training as an industrial hygienist,</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. Well, we don't get medical training as an</p> <p>6 industrial hygienist.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. What specific opinions do you have</p> <p>8 about pleural disease in Libby? You mentioned them</p> <p>9 earlier, but I just want to make sure that we're clear</p> <p>10 about them so we can go over them.</p> <p>11 A. I'm sorry, what --</p> <p>12 Q. You mentioned that you thought pleural disease</p> <p>13 in Libby was - and again, I'm paraphrasing here, and I'd</p> <p>14 like you, to the extent that I misstate this, correct it -</p> <p>15 it's progressive, progresses to death. You mentioned a</p> <p>16 couple of things about pleural disease in Libby very</p> <p>17 quickly when we were talking about it earlier, and I just</p> <p>18 wanted to go over that real quick. If you would, please,</p> <p>19 identify those.</p> <p>20 A. Well, in reading the literature and talking to</p> <p>21 Dr. Black specifically, he's seeing in his patients</p> <p>22 pleural disease which is occurring quicker or manifesting</p> <p>23 itself sooner than they would normally expect; it's more</p> <p>24 painful than other types of exposures outside of Libby; it</p> <p>25 is progressive, they're seeing progression of this</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 disease; and it can be fatal; it's affecting pulmonary</p> <p>2 function.</p> <p>3 Q. So we have pleural disease in Libby that,</p> <p>4 unlike other pleural disease elsewhere, occurs quicker, is</p> <p>5 more painful, progressive, and can be fatal. Did I</p> <p>6 summarize that correctly, sir?</p> <p>7 A. That's my understanding, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And are these opinions that you intend</p> <p>9 to offer when you testify?</p> <p>10 A. Well, I don't know if, if I'm, you know, if</p> <p>11 I'm allowed to offer anything related to medical. I mean</p> <p>12 I'm an industrial hygienist. I'm just saying I read the</p> <p>13 medical literature, I work in Libby, I work with Dr. Black</p> <p>14 as a technical advisor to the TAG, and I get this</p> <p>15 information from the doctors.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So -- and I guess because I asked</p> <p>17 earlier if you had an opinion, and perhaps I should be</p> <p>18 more specific, when I ask if you have an opinion on this,</p> <p>19 you may have an opinion on the weather, but do you have an</p> <p>20 -- is this an opinion that you believe that you can</p> <p>21 testify about in court?</p> <p>22 A. I don't even know how to answer your question.</p> <p>23 I'm not a lawyer. I don't know if I would be allowed to</p> <p>24 opine that.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you believe that you are qualified to opine</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And does that study in any way identify or</p> <p>3 address the pain involved with pleural disease?</p> <p>4 A. Not that I know of.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Does it discuss the onset of pleural</p> <p>6 disease in particular?</p> <p>7 A. I don't -- I haven't read the article in</p> <p>8 awhile. You know, it's mainly a mortality study to look</p> <p>9 at the mortality of workers that worked at the mine.</p> <p>10 Q. Right.</p> <p>11 A. So it may not be specific to pleural disease</p> <p>12 for all I know.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay, okay. And the Rohs study, that is a</p> <p>14 study, a follow-up study -- I guess when I say "the Rohs</p> <p>15 study," we can kind of put Rohs and Lockey together,</p> <p>16 correct? We're talking about the study of the workers in</p> <p>17 the O.M. Scott facility in Marysville, Ohio, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So the Lockey/Rohs study, Lockey</p> <p>20 published in the early '80s, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And then Rohs published a follow-up in, I</p> <p>23 think, either 2007 or 2008, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And what about the Rohs study informed your</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 on those issues?</p> <p>2 A. Well, if, if, you know, reading the medical</p> <p>3 literature and speaking to doctors in Libby qualifies me,</p> <p>4 then, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Because that would be the extent of your basis</p> <p>6 for this opinion. It's review of medical literature and</p> <p>7 discussion -- I think you identified Dr. Black. That was</p> <p>8 the basis of your opinion about Libby pleural disease,</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Which literature have you reviewed to</p> <p>12 form this opinion?</p> <p>13 A. Well, different studies by, I guess, Patricia</p> <p>14 Sullivan, Rohs, Lockey, the Peipens publication,</p> <p>15 Dr. Whitehouse's publications.</p> <p>16 Q. So that would be the Sullivan study, the Rohs</p> <p>17 study, the Lockey study, the Peipens study, and then you</p> <p>18 mentioned Dr. Whitehouse's publications. Are there any</p> <p>19 other publications that have informed your opinions about</p> <p>20 pleural disease in Libby?</p> <p>21 A. Well, I'm sure there are. Those are the ones</p> <p>22 that come to mind. I mean it's hard for me to pinpoint</p> <p>23 specific publications as we sit here.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And the Sullivan study, that is the</p> <p>25 NIOSH mortality follow-up study, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 opinion about pleural disease in Libby?</p> <p>2 A. Well, it's pointing to a greater toxicity of</p> <p>3 the Libby amphibole, that we're seeing disease in lower</p> <p>4 concentrations than we have in previous studies pertaining</p> <p>5 to other types of asbestos.</p> <p>6 Q. And so just so I'm clear, what she reports are</p> <p>7 the exposure levels at the Marysville facility, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Who are we referring to?</p> <p>9 Q. Rohs.</p> <p>10 A. Okay.</p> <p>11 Q. I'll repeat the question. Dr. Rohs reports</p> <p>12 the exposure levels at the Marysville facility, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And she also reports the prevalence of pleural</p> <p>15 abnormalities among the workers, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And she breaks down the population into</p> <p>18 quartiles, correct, or is it quintiles?</p> <p>19 A. As far as I remember, yes. I haven't looked</p> <p>20 at those in awhile, either.</p> <p>21 Q. But four or five exposure categories, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And one of the findings of the studies that</p> <p>24 she focuses on is that we see pleural abnormalities in the</p> <p>25 lower exposure quartile, correct?</p>

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">46</p> <p>1 A. Could you repeat that?</p> <p>2 Q. One of the important findings she addresses in</p> <p>3 the study was that there were individuals with an elevated</p> <p>4 level of pleural abnormalities in the lowest exposure</p> <p>5 quartile, correct?</p> <p>6 A. I believe that's correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Are you aware of any other finding in that</p> <p>8 study that impacts your understanding of pleural disease</p> <p>9 from exposure to asbestos in Libby?</p> <p>10 A. Well, I get the Rohs and the Lockey study</p> <p>11 mixed up, just in my mind, but -- you know, so they saw,</p> <p>12 in the early years, they saw a certain percentage of</p> <p>13 people with pulmonary disease. And then they followed</p> <p>14 these people up after 20-something years, and it went from</p> <p>15 like 4 percent pleural disease up to 26 percent pleural</p> <p>16 disease.</p> <p>17 Q. Right, right. And so that's -- the percent</p> <p>18 you're talking about is the prevalence of pleural</p> <p>19 abnormalities in the working population, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. But nothing in that study addresses the</p> <p>22 pain of pleural disease, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Well, that's correct.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. I guess they don't have the opportunity to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">48</p> <p>1 pulmonary abnormalities. And this was among a working</p> <p>2 population that was working at the time, so I guess from</p> <p>3 that standpoint. But again, the "quicker" part comes</p> <p>4 from, again, the discussion with Dr. Black --</p> <p>5 Q. Okay.</p> <p>6 A. -- that we're seeing these things happen</p> <p>7 quickly.</p> <p>8 Q. So just to be clear, then, the Rohs study does</p> <p>9 not support an opinion about the onset of Libby pleural</p> <p>10 disease from first exposure, does it?</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: Object to the form of the question</p> <p>12 using the term "support". It implies something that is</p> <p>13 not present by his prior answer. To the extent that the</p> <p>14 question purports to summarize a prior answer, it</p> <p>15 incorrectly does so and is therefore improper.</p> <p>16 MR. STANSBURY: I'm going to ask that you keep</p> <p>17 your objections in line with the Federal Rules of Civil</p> <p>18 Procedure, state them briefly and succinctly to preserve</p> <p>19 the record, and not coach the witness.</p> <p>20 You man answer, sir.</p> <p>21 MR. LEWIS: I'm going to -- I want to make a</p> <p>22 statement on the record. There was no coaching there.</p> <p>23 When I practice before the Federal Courts, I understand</p> <p>24 that you have to inform the Court of the basis for your</p> <p>25 objection and not just make some small objection like, "I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">47</p> <p>1 talk to the patients in Libby.</p> <p>2 Q. Well, the people in Marysville, Ohio, were</p> <p>3 exposed to Libby amphibole, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Right. But I'm just saying I get this</p> <p>5 information from Dr. Black who tells me what's --</p> <p>6 Q. Oh, I understand.</p> <p>7 A. -- what's being reported.</p> <p>8 Q. For now let's focus specifically on the</p> <p>9 literature rather than the conversations with Dr. Black.</p> <p>10 There's nothing in the Rohs study which addresses the pain</p> <p>11 involved with Libby pleural disease, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Not that I know of.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And the Rohs study was a morbidity</p> <p>14 study, did not look at mortality, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Right.</p> <p>16 Q. So there is nothing in that study that would</p> <p>17 support an opinion regarding the fatality involved with</p> <p>18 Libby pleural disease, correct?</p> <p>19 A. I believe that would be correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And the issue of "occurs quicker", how does</p> <p>21 the Rohs study impact that opinion?</p> <p>22 A. Well, other than the fact that, you know, it</p> <p>23 was reported that with time-weighted average exposure</p> <p>24 levels of, I think it was, 0.3 to 0.4 or 0.5 per cc</p> <p>25 averaged over an eight-hour day, they were still seeing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">49</p> <p>1 object to the form of the question." That's improper.</p> <p>2 And that's all I did, and there was no coaching of the</p> <p>3 witness in that objection.</p> <p>4 MR. STANSBURY: Again, I'm going to ask you to</p> <p>5 state the objection succinctly and briefly.</p> <p>6 You may answer the question.</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: That was as succinctly and briefly</p> <p>8 as I could make my objection given the nature of your</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I think we should back up</p> <p>11 because I don't know where we were.</p> <p>12 MR. STANSBURY: I think that was his objection</p> <p>13 in the first place was to create that impression of not</p> <p>14 knowing where we are.</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: I move to strike statement of</p> <p>16 Counsel on the record. It's improper. He's not a</p> <p>17 witness. He's a lawyer. He needs to, he needs to shorten</p> <p>18 up his questions and ask understandable questions so we</p> <p>19 don't have these objections.</p> <p>20 MR. STANSBURY: Could you read back the last</p> <p>21 question before the exchange that I had with Mr. Lewis?</p> <p>22 (The record was read by the court reporter as</p> <p>23 follows:</p> <p>24 "QUESTION: So just to be clear, then, the</p> <p>25 Rohs study does not support an opinion about the onset of</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>1 Libby pleural disease from first exposure, does it?")</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Well, from my recollection, it</p> <p>3 doesn't.</p> <p>4 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Okay. And then that leaves</p> <p>5 "progressive." And I guess maybe I should ask you to</p> <p>6 explain what you mean when you say something is</p> <p>7 progressive.</p> <p>8 A. Well, my understanding is that it refers to</p> <p>9 the progression of the disease after the exposure stops.</p> <p>10 Q. And how is this a unique or distinct</p> <p>11 manifestation in Libby?</p> <p>12 A. Well, again, in speaking -- reading the</p> <p>13 medical literature I've read and talking to Dr. Black,</p> <p>14 they believe that it's progressing.</p> <p>15 Q. But if I'm exposed to asbestos working in</p> <p>16 Mississippi, it's chrysotile asbestos, for a few years and</p> <p>17 then my exposures stop, I'm still at risk of developing</p> <p>18 disease, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Well, yes, but it may not progress. It may</p> <p>20 not continue to envelope different portions of the lung.</p> <p>21 Again, I'm not a medical doctor.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So again, I think that your</p> <p>23 qualifications here, perhaps this, you know, can close up</p> <p>24 some of this discussion. You're not a medical expert.</p> <p>25 These issues as to whether Libby disease occurs quicker,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>1 person fill out a questionnaire, correct?</p> <p>2 A. I believe that's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. And the questionnaire included information</p> <p>4 about the potential exposure pathways, correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. They also administered an x-ray, correct?</p> <p>7 A. They did.</p> <p>8 Q. And they had those x-rays read by B readers,</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 A. Right.</p> <p>11 Q. And then they also administered pulmonary</p> <p>12 function tests, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Are you aware of whether the pulmonary</p> <p>15 function tests results were in the Peipens paper?</p> <p>16 A. I don't. I'd have to review the paper, I</p> <p>17 don't remember.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And one of the takeaways from the</p> <p>19 Peipens paper was that approximately 17 percent of the</p> <p>20 screened individuals had pleural abnormalities, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Well, yeah, depending on what group we're</p> <p>22 looking at. They had different percentages.</p> <p>23 Q. But I believe if you looked at just the</p> <p>24 entirety of the population screened, it was approximately</p> <p>25 17 percent, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>1 is more painful, is more progressive, or is more fatal,</p> <p>2 these are not issues in which you intend to offer opinions</p> <p>3 at the confirmation hearing?</p> <p>4 MR. LEWIS: Objection; that's a compound</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Well, those, those are my</p> <p>7 opinions based on what my understanding is of the</p> <p>8 situation. And if someone asks me for that opinion, I'd</p> <p>9 just repeat what we did today.</p> <p>10 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Okay. And so then we'll</p> <p>11 just tie this up real quick, then. We discussed Sullivan,</p> <p>12 we discussed Rohs and Lockey, and then you mentioned</p> <p>13 Peipens as well, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And that was the published finding of the</p> <p>16 ATSDR screening analysis, correct?</p> <p>17 Let me rephrase that. Peipens' paper was the</p> <p>18 published results of the ATSDR's medical surveillance</p> <p>19 program in Libby in the summers of the 2000 and 2001,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And that study examined individuals by</p> <p>23 giving them a questionnaire, administering an x-ray, and</p> <p>24 examine -- strike that.</p> <p>25 In that medical surveillance, the ATSDR had each</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>1 A. That could be correct.</p> <p>2 Q. Eleven hundred eighty-six people, does that</p> <p>3 sound about right?</p> <p>4 A. Well, the Peipens study talked about, I</p> <p>5 believe it was 9,000-something --</p> <p>6 Q. Oh, no.</p> <p>7 A. -- people.</p> <p>8 Q. I understand. But did they --</p> <p>9 MR. LEWIS: I object. You promised this</p> <p>10 witness you would not interrupt him and you cut him off in</p> <p>11 his answer.</p> <p>12 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Did you have anything else</p> <p>13 to add?</p> <p>14 A. Well, no. You threw a number out there that I</p> <p>15 didn't know where it came from.</p> <p>16 Q. Let me put the number into context. They</p> <p>17 administered x-rays on approximately 6600 people. Does</p> <p>18 that sound about right to you?</p> <p>19 A. That sounds about right.</p> <p>20 Q. And I believe 1,186 were found to have pleural</p> <p>21 abnormalities, correct?</p> <p>22 A. I don't remember the number.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. How does the Peipens paper inform any</p> <p>24 opinions that you may have about pleural disease in Libby?</p> <p>25 A. Well, the Peipens paper, I think, pointed out</p>

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">54</p> <p>1 that there is a potential -- there is environmental -- or</p> <p>2 disease caused from environmental exposure to Libby</p> <p>3 amphibole.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. But that does not --</p> <p>5 A. As well as, you know, I mean, basically, the</p> <p>6 highest rates were in the working population. In their</p> <p>7 exposure category where they could not identify a pathway,</p> <p>8 that percentage was 6.7 percent, so that's roughly 3 times</p> <p>9 higher than what you would expect to find in other types</p> <p>10 of population-based studies that have been done looking at</p> <p>11 the prevalence of abnormalities of the lung associated</p> <p>12 with asbestos.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. That paper, however, did not inform</p> <p>14 your opinion as to whether pleural disease occurs more</p> <p>15 quickly in Libby, though, correct?</p> <p>16 A. That's probably correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Nor does the Peipens paper inform your</p> <p>18 opinion as to whether Libby pleural disease was more</p> <p>19 painful, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Does it inform your -- does the Peipens paper</p> <p>22 inform your opinion as to whether pleural disease in Libby</p> <p>23 is more progressive?</p> <p>24 A. Well, I don't know how to answer that</p> <p>25 question, I guess -- probably not.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">56</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Sitting here today, does the 2004 paper</p> <p>2 in any way inform your understanding as to whether pleural</p> <p>3 disease in Libby is more painful?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Sitting here today, does the 2004 paper in any</p> <p>6 way inform your opinion as to whether pleural disease in</p> <p>7 Libby is more progressive?</p> <p>8 A. I believe it does, yes. I think that</p> <p>9 progression is discussed. I don't know if -- I don't</p> <p>10 remember the specifics of that paper.</p> <p>11 Q. So sitting here today, you cannot think of a</p> <p>12 specific way in which that paper informs your</p> <p>13 understanding of progression of disease in Libby?</p> <p>14 A. I can't remember specifically how it discusses</p> <p>15 that topic as I sit here today.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And the 2004 paper by Whitehouse does</p> <p>17 not inform your opinion about the fatality involved with</p> <p>18 pleural disease in Libby, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Not that I know of.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. You mentioned on a couple of occasions</p> <p>21 Dr. Black, your conversations with Dr. Black informed your</p> <p>22 opinions, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And who is Dr. Black?</p> <p>25 A. Dr. Black works in the card clinic up in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">55</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And it certainly doesn't impact your</p> <p>2 opinion as to whether pleural disease in Libby was more</p> <p>3 fatal, correct?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And then you mention Dr. Whitehouse's</p> <p>6 paper. Which paper was that?</p> <p>7 A. Well, he's had several. I've looked at</p> <p>8 several of his recent publications.</p> <p>9 Q. You published one in 2004, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And you also published a paper in 2008</p> <p>12 regarding mesothelioma, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So the 2004 paper, how did that paper inform</p> <p>15 your opinions as about pleural disease in Libby?</p> <p>16 A. I believe that in -- Dr. Whitehouse's papers</p> <p>17 describe the disease rates and the effects on pulmonary</p> <p>18 function, and I believe the 2004 paper talks about the</p> <p>19 pleural disease rate, but I could be wrong.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Does it inform your opinion as to</p> <p>21 whether -- does the Whitehouse 2004 paper inform your</p> <p>22 opinion as to whether pleural disease occurs more quickly</p> <p>23 in Libby?</p> <p>24 A. I don't remember if that was discussed in the</p> <p>25 paper or not.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">57</p> <p>1 Libby.</p> <p>2 Q. What is his role there?</p> <p>3 A. I believe he's the director or he runs the</p> <p>4 card clinic.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, runs the card clinic. And what kind of</p> <p>6 doctor is Dr. Black?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know.</p> <p>8 Q. Is he a pulmonologist?</p> <p>9 A. I don't know for sure if he's a pulmonologist.</p> <p>10 I guess I haven't looked at his resume.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Do you think that's important, what</p> <p>12 kind of doctor -- a person, a doctor's training, do you</p> <p>13 think that's relevant to their work as a doctor?</p> <p>14 A. I suppose it could be, sure.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And sitting here today, you're not</p> <p>16 aware of any pulmonary training Dr. Black has had,</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 A. No. Like I say, I haven't looked at his</p> <p>19 resume.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Were you aware that Dr. Black was</p> <p>21 trained as a pediatrician?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Do you believe -- okay, so you weren't</p> <p>24 aware of that.</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">58</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And you weren't aware that he worked at</p> <p>2 St. John's Hospitals -- St. John's Hospital for many years</p> <p>3 in pediatrics, correct?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. You weren't aware that he never did a</p> <p>6 residency or fellowship in radiology, pulmonary medicine,</p> <p>7 or occupational medicine, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. But your conversations with him have</p> <p>10 informed your opinions about pleural disease in Libby?</p> <p>11 A. And what he's seeing in patients that they're</p> <p>12 screening through the card clinic.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Again, though, as you said it earlier,</p> <p>14 you're not a medical professional. Your opinions are</p> <p>15 based on conversations with Dr. Brad Black in review of</p> <p>16 the studies that we mentioned earlier, correct?</p> <p>17 MR. LEWIS: Objection. This is a summary of</p> <p>18 his testimony. It's improper, it's compound. And</p> <p>19 therefore, it's an improper question, and I object to the</p> <p>20 form of the question.</p> <p>21 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) You may answer.</p> <p>22 A. Yeah, in forming my opinions related to the</p> <p>23 toxicity of the Libby amphibole, I think is what I said is</p> <p>24 that those are the articles which I've read most recently,</p> <p>25 but not all of the articles I've read pertaining to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">60</p> <p>1 A. Well, the basis of that opinion, again, is my</p> <p>2 review of the medical literature and scientific journal</p> <p>3 articles.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you believe that epidemiology should be the</p> <p>5 basis of establishing which exposure levels can cause</p> <p>6 disease?</p> <p>7 A. I do believe that is one part of it, but it</p> <p>8 certainly isn't the only part of it.</p> <p>9 Q. What other parts are there?</p> <p>10 A. Well, there are -- basic clinical studies is</p> <p>11 another part of it, what is being seen in clinics with</p> <p>12 patients. Some of that may not appear as an epidemiologic</p> <p>13 study. And, I guess, other types of studies in different</p> <p>14 types of plants where they're seeing disease rates or</p> <p>15 mortality rates that may or may not be considered an</p> <p>16 epidemiologic study are important from an industrial</p> <p>17 hygiene standpoint.</p> <p>18 Q. So your opinions on which exposure levels can</p> <p>19 cause disease are based in part on case reports of disease</p> <p>20 cases that have occurred in various locations?</p> <p>21 A. In part. That could be part of it, sure.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you give greater weight to an</p> <p>23 epidemiological study than you would to a case report?</p> <p>24 A. I think if it's a well-done epidemiologic</p> <p>25 study it would be given more weight.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">59</p> <p>1 toxicity of asbestos, including Libby amphibole.</p> <p>2 Q. But sitting here today, there's no other</p> <p>3 article you can think of that informs any opinions you</p> <p>4 have about any pleural disease in Libby?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you have any specific opinions</p> <p>7 about -- let me back up a second. Are you familiar with</p> <p>8 the term "diffuse pleural thickening"?</p> <p>9 A. Well, I've seen the term.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have any opinions about diffuse pleural</p> <p>11 thickening?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. That's not something you intend to</p> <p>14 opine about at the confirmation hearing, is it?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And you're not an epidemiologist</p> <p>17 either, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. You have no education that qualifies you to</p> <p>20 opine on epidemiology, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you have an opinion on the levels of</p> <p>23 exposure that cause asbestos-related diseases?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And what is the basis of that opinion?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. But your opinion on which exposure</p> <p>2 levels can cause disease, they're based on your review of</p> <p>3 literature, correct?</p> <p>4 A. And my, yeah, work with asbestos; my 20 or 30</p> <p>5 years of an industrial hygienist reading literature.</p> <p>6 Q. But as an industrial hygienist, your role is</p> <p>7 to focus on the actual exposures themselves and preventing</p> <p>8 those exposures, correct?</p> <p>9 A. That's a big part of our job, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Do industrial hygienists offer opinions</p> <p>11 in the course of their role as industrial hygienists as to</p> <p>12 which levels of exposures can cause disease?</p> <p>13 A. Well, if they were seeing disease rates within</p> <p>14 the plant they're working with, I think their information</p> <p>15 would be important to establishing what the level of</p> <p>16 exposure can be that causes disease, sure.</p> <p>17 Q. But what information would that be?</p> <p>18 A. Well, from there, if they're sampling a</p> <p>19 workplace and they have medical records saying that -- or</p> <p>20 medical exams showing a certain disease rate in a working</p> <p>21 population, then, sure, that provides information of</p> <p>22 exposure that could potentially cause disease.</p> <p>23 Q. But is it the -- strike that.</p> <p>24 Is it the industrial hygienist, though, who would</p> <p>25 take those exposure data as well as the medical</p>

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>1 information and reach an opinion as to whether an exposure</p> <p>2 has caused disease? Is that the industrial hygienist's</p> <p>3 role?</p> <p>4 A. No. The industrial hygienist's role would be</p> <p>5 to provide that data to people that wanted to simulate it</p> <p>6 and perhaps do an epidemiologic study.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So an industrial hygienist is a</p> <p>8 critical component of developing this epidemiological</p> <p>9 understanding, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. However, the industrial hygienist is -- strike</p> <p>12 that.</p> <p>13 However, the industrial hygienist's role is to focus</p> <p>14 on, specifically, the exposure data, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Well, for the most part, making sure we</p> <p>16 collect representative samples that could be used in an</p> <p>17 epidemiologic study, as well as controlling the exposure.</p> <p>18 Q. Industrial hygienists clearly don't do the</p> <p>19 medical examinations themselves, do they?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Industrial hygienists do not determine</p> <p>22 toxicity based on mortality compared to exposure levels,</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. That's not an industrial hygienist's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 distribution procedure in this case?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So you have no opinion on the medical</p> <p>4 criteria contained in that TDP, do you?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. And you have not evaluated the exposure</p> <p>7 treated in that TDP, have you?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. So you intend to offer no opinions about those</p> <p>10 issues at the confirmation hearing, correct?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And you are not offering any opinions</p> <p>13 specific to the objections stated by the Libby claimants,</p> <p>14 are you?</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Objection; lack of foundation.</p> <p>16 I'm not sure he's seen the objections.</p> <p>17 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Well, let's establish that.</p> <p>18 Have you reviewed the objections submitted by the Libby</p> <p>19 claimants?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. So you have no opinion on those objections, do</p> <p>22 you?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Do you have any opinion regarding the</p> <p>25 amounts paid in settlement to past Libby claimants?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 role, is it?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Now, you're also not an expert on</p> <p>4 insurance issues, are you?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. You have no opinion as to Grace's historical</p> <p>7 insurance policies, correct?</p> <p>8 A. I guess I don't know what you mean by</p> <p>9 "historical insurance policies." I --</p> <p>10 Q. This is something you know nothing about,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Well, other than, I mean, I've certainly read</p> <p>13 the Grace exhibits where there are memos from the</p> <p>14 insurance companies, but I don't know what your question</p> <p>15 is pertaining to.</p> <p>16 Q. You have no opinion as to how -- well, strike</p> <p>17 that. You have no --</p> <p>18 MR. LEWIS: We will concede that this witness</p> <p>19 will not offer any testimony concerning insurance issues</p> <p>20 in this case.</p> <p>21 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Okay, let me ask one more</p> <p>22 follow-up on that. You have no opinion on what</p> <p>23 constitutes a product for insurance purposes, do you?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Have you reviewed the trust</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>1 A. What do you mean do I have an opinion?</p> <p>2 Q. Well, I mean do you intend to offer any</p> <p>3 opinion about the value of past settlements?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Do you intend to offer any opinion</p> <p>6 about the exposures that any individual Libby claimant may</p> <p>7 have had?</p> <p>8 A. Well, I mean that's what I do is I basically</p> <p>9 evaluate exposures. So if I was asked to, if I was given</p> <p>10 information, I guess I could provide an opinion on that.</p> <p>11 Q. Right. So if you had information on a</p> <p>12 person's exposure, you could evaluate that exposure,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you reviewed any of the exposures for any</p> <p>16 of the Libby claimants?</p> <p>17 A. I don't know who they are, so I don't -- I</p> <p>18 guess I haven't reviewed them.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So sitting here today, you do not</p> <p>20 intend to offer any testimony about an individual</p> <p>21 claimant's exposure, do you?</p> <p>22 A. At this time, I guess I haven't seen the</p> <p>23 claimant, so I don't know what their exposure was.</p> <p>24 MR. STANSBURY: Will you mark this as an</p> <p>25 exhibit, please? Madam court reporter, if you could mark</p>

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>1 that as Exhibit 1, please.</p> <p>2 (Document marked Deposition</p> <p>3 Exhibit No. 1 for identification.)</p> <p>4 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>5 Q. Dr. Spear, I'm handing you what's been marked</p> <p>6 as Exhibit 1, which is the CV of Dr. Terry Spear, and it's</p> <p>7 dated May 2008. Is this your most recent CV?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. When was --</p> <p>10 A. I have one with me.</p> <p>11 Q. Oh. Could I get that one, please?</p> <p>12 A. You bet.</p> <p>13 Q. Great.</p> <p>14 MR. LEWIS: We're probably going to need some</p> <p>15 copies. Would this be a good time to take a break?</p> <p>16 MR. STANSBURY: Sure, let's take a break.</p> <p>17 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9:43. We're off</p> <p>18 the record.</p> <p>19 (A brief recess was taken.)</p> <p>20 VIDEOGRAPHER: This is Tape 2 of the</p> <p>21 videotaped deposition of Dr. Terry Spear.</p> <p>22 The time is 9:49. We're on the record.</p> <p>23 MR. STANSBURY: Okay. And so do we have --</p> <p>24 actually, let's make this Exhibit 2.</p> <p>25 MS. ROHRHOFER: Oh, really? Okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>1 Professional Experience," tell me if I read this</p> <p>2 correctly. It's on the second page (quoted as read):</p> <p>3 "Provide consultation to a variety of general</p> <p>4 industry and mining companies on program document</p> <p>5 development, health and safety compliance auditing,</p> <p>6 regulatory issues, industrial hygiene field sampling,</p> <p>7 on-site hazard assessment, and training. Over 20 years of</p> <p>8 experience providing expert witness testimony involving</p> <p>9 consultation and participation in more than 50 personal</p> <p>10 injury and illness liability litigation cases for</p> <p>11 plaintiffs, defendants, private industry, and insurance</p> <p>12 companies."</p> <p>13 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. I want to focus on the expert witness</p> <p>16 testimony. You list here: Plaintiffs, defendants,</p> <p>17 private industry, and insurance companies.</p> <p>18 You were also retained as an expert witness by the</p> <p>19 U.S. Government at one time, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And that was in connection with what?</p> <p>22 A. The criminal trial?</p> <p>23 Q. Yes. When were you retained by the U.S.</p> <p>24 Government?</p> <p>25 A. I believe it was sometime in 2005.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>1 MR. STANSBURY: Yeah, because we still have</p> <p>2 the old exhibit, we have the old CV as Exhibit 1.</p> <p>3 (Document marked Deposition</p> <p>4 Exhibit No. 2 for identification.)</p> <p>5 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>6 Q. So I'm handing you what is marked as Exhibit</p> <p>7 2, which is your June 2009 CV.</p> <p>8 A. I'm confused.</p> <p>9 Q. There was, the May one was 1. That one was 1.</p> <p>10 A. This is marked 1 but it's 2009.</p> <p>11 Q. Yeah, we're not going to use old one. We're</p> <p>12 not going to use the old one. We're going to use the new</p> <p>13 one instead.</p> <p>14 (Off-the-record discussion.)</p> <p>15 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>16 Q. So you have a -- according to your CV, your BA</p> <p>17 is in microbiology, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. You have a master's in environmental health,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And then a Ph.D. in environmental health from</p> <p>23 the University of Minnesota, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And in your CV under "Related</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">69</p> <p>1 Q. Do you recall if it was winter or spring or</p> <p>2 summer?</p> <p>3 A. Not really. I believe, I believe it was</p> <p>4 sometime in 2005 when I was -- when I first started doing</p> <p>5 work in that issue. I may have been contacted before</p> <p>6 that. I don't remember the chronology.</p> <p>7 Q. Who is the, which -- do you remember who the</p> <p>8 -- well, strike that.</p> <p>9 Who was the first person you recall contacting you</p> <p>10 from the U.S. Government?</p> <p>11 A. Kris McLean.</p> <p>12 Q. And who is Kris McLean?</p> <p>13 A. He's the district attorney out of Missoula.</p> <p>14 Q. And what did he ask you?</p> <p>15 A. He asked me if I'd be interested in discussing</p> <p>16 participating in the criminal trial.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And was this over the phone, this first</p> <p>18 conversation?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Was it a substantive call or was it just a</p> <p>21 "hi", get to know each other, followed up by a later</p> <p>22 meeting?</p> <p>23 A. It was just, yeah, that type of call.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. When did you first meet -- was the next</p> <p>25 meeting with Mr. McLean face to face?</p>

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">70</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. When did that occur, do you recall?</p> <p>3 A. Again, I believe it would have been in 2005.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. I don't recall exactly when.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And could you briefly summarize that</p> <p>7 first face-to-face meeting with Mr. McLean?</p> <p>8 A. Well, I believe they presented me with the</p> <p>9 allegations in the trial proceedings and we discussed</p> <p>10 those. And I believe he asked me if I would be willing to</p> <p>11 be a witness on, I think -- originally, it was on two of</p> <p>12 those aspects.</p> <p>13 Q. Which two aspects?</p> <p>14 A. I believe, you know, one pertained to</p> <p>15 sanitation. I don't remember -- both of them pertained to</p> <p>16 similar things, but -- (pause.)</p> <p>17 Q. So one was sanitation and the other one?</p> <p>18 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>19 Q. But it related to the historical operation of</p> <p>20 the mine and mill up in Libby?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, I think that would be fair.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Did you talk to him at all about any of</p> <p>23 your work regarding the forests around Libby?</p> <p>24 A. Well, no, because at that time, we'd just</p> <p>25 begun that work in late '03 and we hadn't published</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">72</p> <p>1 Q. And you also offered opinions about what the</p> <p>2 industrial hygiene standards were at various times during</p> <p>3 that operation, correct?</p> <p>4 A. And I don't remember if we -- if that was part</p> <p>5 of the opinion. I mean, certainly, it was on standards</p> <p>6 pertaining to how do we keep materials from leaving the</p> <p>7 workplace and getting its way into the home.</p> <p>8 Q. Right. But you also were of the opinion that</p> <p>9 W.R. Grace had failed to comply with the industrial</p> <p>10 hygiene standards that were in place at that time,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. What were some of the areas where you</p> <p>14 found W.R. Grace to be lacking?</p> <p>15 A. Well, No. 1, lack of informing the worker of</p> <p>16 the hazards of the materials, Libby amphibole that they</p> <p>17 were working with --</p> <p>18 Q. Right.</p> <p>19 A. -- lack of control of the dust, whether it be</p> <p>20 engineering controls, administrative controls, or personal</p> <p>21 protective equipment; lack of sanitation or control of</p> <p>22 dispersion and taking this material home. That's, that</p> <p>23 was the main part of it.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Did you meet with anybody else from the</p> <p>25 U.S. Government other than Mr. McLean?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">71</p> <p>1 anything on that.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you tell him that was ongoing?</p> <p>3 A. Well, not then --</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. -- because it wasn't really ongoing.</p> <p>6 Q. Gotcha.</p> <p>7 A. I mean it was discussed and we were planning</p> <p>8 things. We hadn't published anything. I notified him</p> <p>9 after we had a publication.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And so obviously, you agreed to serve</p> <p>11 as an expert witness for the Government, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And were you paid for your services?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. What was the paying rate?</p> <p>16 A. I believe \$150 an hour.</p> <p>17 Q. And what specific services did you provide for</p> <p>18 the U.S. Government?</p> <p>19 A. I provided Mr. McLean with an opinion.</p> <p>20 Q. In the form of a written report?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And this written report commented on</p> <p>23 the historical vermiculite mining and milling operation in</p> <p>24 Libby, correct?</p> <p>25 A. I believe it did.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">73</p> <p>1 A. Well, when we had the first meeting, they came</p> <p>2 over to Montana Tech and there were two other individuals</p> <p>3 that worked for the EPA, and I don't remember who they</p> <p>4 were.</p> <p>5 Q. But they were EPA individuals?</p> <p>6 A. That's what I understand.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. How many times did you meet with</p> <p>8 Mr. McLean?</p> <p>9 A. Just once.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And then you submitted a report. Did</p> <p>11 you have any other conversations with him over the phone?</p> <p>12 A. I believe we had other phone conversations,</p> <p>13 just keeping me updated on -- at least initially, like</p> <p>14 2005, maybe part of 2006.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. What about 2008 - 2009? Did you</p> <p>16 continue a dialogue with Mr. McLean?</p> <p>17 A. No. The only dialogue would be if we had a</p> <p>18 publication, I wanted to make sure that there was no</p> <p>19 conflict of interest in his eyes, so I would send him the</p> <p>20 fact that we had a paper published pertaining to Libby and</p> <p>21 just to let him know.</p> <p>22 Q. So you informed Mr. McLean about these various</p> <p>23 forest studies that you were doing, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And you also informed the publications that</p>

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">74</p> <p>1 you were working with the U.S. Government at the time?</p> <p>2 A. I'm sorry, I lost that one.</p> <p>3 Q. Oh. So you mentioned you were concerned about</p> <p>4 a conflict of interest with the Government and you</p> <p>5 disclosed to the Government that you were writing these</p> <p>6 papers, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you make a disclosure in the other</p> <p>9 direction as well to these papers that you were testifying</p> <p>10 for the U.S. Government?</p> <p>11 A. I didn't.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And just so we're clear, this is --</p> <p>13 we're talking about an article in 2006 that was submitted</p> <p>14 to the International Journal for Scientific Research Into</p> <p>15 the Environment and its Relationship with Human Kind,</p> <p>16 right? Is that your 2006 article? You might have it in</p> <p>17 front of you.</p> <p>18 A. This is what you're referring to?</p> <p>19 Q. May I see?</p> <p>20 A. (Handing document to counsel.)</p> <p>21 MR. STANSBURY: Could we mark this as an</p> <p>22 exhibit, please?</p> <p>23 (Document marked Deposition</p> <p>24 Exhibit No. 3 for identification.)</p> <p>25 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">76</p> <p>1 behalf of a plaintiff in a Libby case?</p> <p>2 A. I guess -- I don't remember. It could have</p> <p>3 been the mid 2000s. I don't remember the last time I</p> <p>4 testified.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. When were you retained in connection</p> <p>6 with this case?</p> <p>7 A. I believe it was 2008.</p> <p>8 Q. 2008. So you had testified in the mid 2000s,</p> <p>9 as you said, on behalf of individuals exposed to asbestos</p> <p>10 from Libby, correct?</p> <p>11 A. To the best of my memory.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And at this time, you were working as a</p> <p>13 consultant for the U.S. Government in a criminal trial</p> <p>14 against W.R. Grace involving alleged criminal releases of</p> <p>15 asbestos into the ambient air, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Well, again, takehome exposure is what I was</p> <p>17 asked to testify on.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay.</p> <p>19 A. My testimony, as I understand it, for Kris</p> <p>20 McLean was to basically evaluate how they could have</p> <p>21 controlled asbestos takehome with sanitation procedures.</p> <p>22 Q. And do you have your 2007 article in front of</p> <p>23 you, sir, in your folder?</p> <p>24 A. Is this the firewood harvesting?</p> <p>25 Q. Yes, sir.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">75</p> <p>1 Q. So we're looking at "Trees as reservoirs for</p> <p>2 amphibole fibers in Libby, Montana," published 2006. And</p> <p>3 the authors are Tony Ward, Terry Spear, Julie Hart, Curtis</p> <p>4 Noonan, Andrij Holian --</p> <p>5 A. Yeah.</p> <p>6 Q. -- okay, Myron Getman, and James Webber. Did</p> <p>7 I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And this article - we can discuss it in</p> <p>10 detail a little bit later, but just so I'm clear - this</p> <p>11 article, you examined tree bark to determine the asbestos</p> <p>12 contents in that tree bark, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And at the time of this article's</p> <p>15 publication, you were working as a consultant to the U.S.</p> <p>16 Government in connection with the criminal case, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Had you also be retained by individuals who</p> <p>19 had lawsuits against W.R. Grace for personal injury</p> <p>20 arising from exposures in and around the mine?</p> <p>21 A. At that time, I don't believe so.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Do you recall -- you had testified</p> <p>23 previously, though, on behalf of plaintiffs, correct?</p> <p>24 A. I have, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. When was the last time you had testified on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 MR. STANSBURY: Okay. Could we mark that as</p> <p>3 an exhibit, please, madam court reporter?</p> <p>4 (Document marked Deposition</p> <p>5 Exhibit No. 4 for identification.)</p> <p>6 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>7 Q. Exhibit 4 is "Evaluation of Asbestos Exposures</p> <p>8 during Firewood-Harvesting Simulations in Libby, Montana,</p> <p>9 USA - Preliminary Data", by Julie Hart, Tony Ward, Terry</p> <p>10 M. Spear, Kelly Crispen, and Tara R. Zolnikov.</p> <p>11 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And this is published in the "Annals of</p> <p>14 Occupational Hygiene" in 2007. Is that correct, sir?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And in this paper, you're looking at</p> <p>17 activities that could occur in the forest and potential</p> <p>18 asbestos exposures that could arise from those activities,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. Well, specifically from harvesting firewood,</p> <p>21 yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Can I get the 2009 -- do you also have</p> <p>23 the 2009 paper in front of you, sir?</p> <p>24 A. I don't.</p> <p>25 (Document marked Deposition</p>

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 Exhibit No. 5 for identification.)</p> <p>2 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>3 Q. I'm handing you what has been marked as</p> <p>4 Exhibit 5. Okay. I've handed you what has been marked as</p> <p>5 Exhibit 5, which is "Fate of Libby Amphobile Fibers When</p> <p>6 Burning Contaminated Firewood," by Tony Ward, Julie Hart,</p> <p>7 Terry Spear, Brienne Meyer, and James Webber, published in</p> <p>8 2009 in "Environmental Science Technology".</p> <p>9 Is that correct, sir?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And this article examined potential</p> <p>12 asbestos exposures that could occur when using wood as</p> <p>13 firewood in an indoor heating oven, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yeah, I don't know if it evaluated exposures.</p> <p>15 We were mainly trying to determine if wood that was</p> <p>16 contaminated with the asbestos was burned, where would it</p> <p>17 end up, I mean where did it go.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. So this was not aimed at looking at</p> <p>19 potential exposures.</p> <p>20 A. Well, not -- no, because we didn't really</p> <p>21 concentrate on doing an exposure measurement. It was</p> <p>22 mainly just sampling within the stove itself.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. The 2007 paper, however, you are</p> <p>24 looking at, Exhibit 4, you are looking at potential</p> <p>25 exposures, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 Q. Was your concern that potentially people could</p> <p>2 be exposed to asbestos when burning firewood?</p> <p>3 A. I believe that would be fair, that there could</p> <p>4 be a potential concern.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And with Exhibit 4, the 2007 paper,</p> <p>6 there was a concern that there could be exposure to</p> <p>7 asbestos in the harvesting of firewood, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Exposure in the ambient air, correct --</p> <p>10 well, strike that.</p> <p>11 This would be airborne exposures that arise from</p> <p>12 activities involved with harvesting firewood, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And those could potentially cause</p> <p>15 disease, correct?</p> <p>16 A. I suppose that's correct, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Right. That's your concern is preventing</p> <p>18 disease, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And so with the 2006 paper, Exhibit 3; the</p> <p>21 2007 paper, Exhibit 4; the 2009 paper, Exhibit 5; when</p> <p>22 submitting these papers, you did not disclose to any of</p> <p>23 the publications that you were testifying as -- strike</p> <p>24 that.</p> <p>25 With respect to Exhibit 3, the 2006 paper; Exhibit</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Did you ever talk about this paper with</p> <p>3 Kris McLean?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Did you ever talk about the 2009 paper</p> <p>6 with Kris McLean?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. But you did discuss Exhibit 3, which was the</p> <p>9 2006 paper, you discussed that with Kris McLean?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Oh, you never discussed any of these with Kris</p> <p>12 McLean?</p> <p>13 A. No. I basically would notify him of what we</p> <p>14 were trying to publish and that we were doing research up</p> <p>15 in Libby.</p> <p>16 Q. So you made him aware that you were doing this</p> <p>17 research, though, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And the 2009 paper, you say it does not</p> <p>20 focus on potential exposures, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Well, not -- that wasn't the main aim of the</p> <p>22 study. It was to determine where are the fibers when you</p> <p>23 burn wood contaminated with the amphibole asbestos. Do</p> <p>24 they go out the stack? Do they go -- stay in the</p> <p>25 ductwork? Do they stay in the ash?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 4, the 2007 paper; and 2009, the -- which is Exhibit 5,</p> <p>2 the 2009 paper, you did not disclose to the journals that</p> <p>3 you had been retained as an expert by the U.S. Government?</p> <p>4 A. I didn't.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Did you disclose to any of the journals</p> <p>6 that you had previously testified on behalf of Libby</p> <p>7 claimants?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you disclose to any of the journals about</p> <p>10 your retention in this matter here?</p> <p>11 A. I didn't. I wasn't -- well, no. I wasn't</p> <p>12 retained for this case until 2008 so -- (pause.)</p> <p>13 Q. But for the 2009 paper, Exhibit 5, this was</p> <p>14 published after you were retained, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Why didn't you feel it was necessary to</p> <p>17 disclose that information to the journals?</p> <p>18 A. Well, because we are doing research to</p> <p>19 determine pathways of exposure. And it's not being paid</p> <p>20 for by any law firm, and I'm not doing it for a law firm.</p> <p>21 I'm doing it as a research exercise to try to determine</p> <p>22 pathways of exposure.</p> <p>23 Q. But this work is relevant to your opinions in</p> <p>24 this case, correct?</p> <p>25 A. I think all the work I've done in Libby before</p>

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 these publications is relevant, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So, for example, the 2007 paper, in</p> <p>3 your mind, this paper could be used to support an opinion</p> <p>4 that individuals in Libby could develop disease from</p> <p>5 harvesting lumber, correct?</p> <p>6 A. I suppose it could be.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. "Yes" or "no," sir? Do you agree that</p> <p>8 that's true?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And presumably, this could be an</p> <p>11 individual who is a Libby claimant, correct? Are you</p> <p>12 aware of any Libby claimants who may have been exposed in</p> <p>13 the forest?</p> <p>14 A. I've never been involved with a court case</p> <p>15 that involved forestry or exposure to firewood, no.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any disease that's</p> <p>17 arisen from exposure to forestry or firewood?</p> <p>18 A. I'm not. I haven't seen any data on that.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So sitting here today, you have no</p> <p>20 opinion as to whether exposures in the woods at Libby</p> <p>21 could cause disease?</p> <p>22 A. Well, again, I'm not a doctor and I don't want</p> <p>23 to state an opinion as to if our research is saying that</p> <p>24 -- we don't say that in the research that it could cause a</p> <p>25 disease. We basically say that there could be exposures</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 amphibole, I'm not sure we know what level, lowest level</p> <p>2 was going to cause disease, then I guess any level would</p> <p>3 concern me.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And so this research, the 2007 paper,</p> <p>5 just so we're clear, who paid for that research?</p> <p>6 A. Which one again?</p> <p>7 Q. The 2007, Exhibit 4, the harvesting study.</p> <p>8 A. This was paid for through the University of</p> <p>9 Utah, I believe.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 A. And it wasn't mine. It was Julie Hart's</p> <p>12 research. It was her grant.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you ever send a copy of this to Kris</p> <p>14 McLean?</p> <p>15 A. I don't remember if I did or not. I may very</p> <p>16 well have. I just wanted to keep him informed that we</p> <p>17 were doing the work up in Libby.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. So you're doing the work in Libby,</p> <p>19 establishing these exposures. And then today, you're</p> <p>20 offering testimony about potential exposures that could be</p> <p>21 occurring in Libby that could cause disease, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And a basis of that opinion is, in part, the</p> <p>24 studies, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Well, I rely on these studies, yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 and perhaps it would lead to a concern for disease.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Well, let's narrow this down a bit,</p> <p>3 because earlier we were talking, I'd asked you about</p> <p>4 whether you had opinions as to what exposure levels could</p> <p>5 cause disease. And you said that you did, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And that was based in part on your</p> <p>8 review of epidemiological literature, correct?</p> <p>9 A. In part, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. As well as case reports, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion as to whether</p> <p>13 the exposures identified in Exhibit 4 can cause disease?</p> <p>14 A. And Exhibit 4 --</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. -- is the firewood harvesting?</p> <p>17 Q. Yes, sir.</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, I mean we wanted to determine if -- we</p> <p>19 knew the wood was contaminated, so we wanted to determine</p> <p>20 can we liberate fibers if we do this activity. So based</p> <p>21 on the personal breathing zone samples, we, you know, we</p> <p>22 found that fibers are liberated.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And were they liberated at a level that</p> <p>24 you believe could pose a threat to human health?</p> <p>25 A. Well, since -- particularly for Libby</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And you're being compensated for being</p> <p>2 here today, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. What is your -- is your hourly rate still \$150</p> <p>5 an hour?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So you did these studies that were</p> <p>8 published in 2006, 2007, and 2009 without disclosing that</p> <p>9 you had previously testified on behalf of individuals who</p> <p>10 got disease from Libby, correct?</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Disclosing to who?</p> <p>12 MR. STANSBURY: To -- fair point.</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Okay.</p> <p>14 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) To the journal, correct?</p> <p>15 To either -- any of the journals, correct?</p> <p>16 A. I did not disclose it to the journal, but I</p> <p>17 wasn't the grant administrator, either.</p> <p>18 Q. But you are one of the authors listed,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And then today, you are being</p> <p>22 compensated to offer opinions that are based in part on</p> <p>23 this research you've previously done, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And in particular, and with respect to</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">86</p> <p>1 the 2009 paper, you were retained in this case when that</p> <p>2 paper was being considered for publication, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. It was being considered in 2008.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And you at no point disclosed to the</p> <p>5 journal that you were receiving compensation to offer</p> <p>6 opinions about exposures in the same forest that were the</p> <p>7 subject of that paper?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Did you review the guidelines for</p> <p>10 disclosing conflicts of interest before submitting any of</p> <p>11 those three papers?</p> <p>12 A. Well, I didn't. I basically helped put the</p> <p>13 papers together, and I think Tony Ward and Julie Hart</p> <p>14 submitted them, so -- (pause.)</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Did you disclose to them that you had</p> <p>16 been working for -- you had historically worked for</p> <p>17 plaintiffs?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. They know that I have been.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And they knew that you were working for</p> <p>20 the U.S. Government?</p> <p>21 A. I don't know if they knew that or not. I</p> <p>22 believe so.</p> <p>23 Q. But they certainly knew that you were involved</p> <p>24 with personal injury cases involving exposures in Libby,</p> <p>25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. It's a pretty long report. Let's see</p> <p>3 here, it's 27 pages; is that right?</p> <p>4 A. I believe that's like 32 counting references.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, counting references, okay. And the</p> <p>6 paragraphs are numbered, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And some of these paragraphs deal with related</p> <p>9 points and some of them deal with very different points,</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 A. That would be fair, I think.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. What I'd like to do is kind of walk</p> <p>13 through the report so we can kind of identify which</p> <p>14 paragraphs relate to specific opinions you intend to offer</p> <p>15 at the hearing. And to the extent that we can kind of</p> <p>16 group of the paragraphs together, perhaps we could do so.</p> <p>17 Would you be willing to walk through that with me?</p> <p>18 A. Sure.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Now, Paragraph 1, your name and where</p> <p>20 you live, I think we can move past that. And 2 and 3 are</p> <p>21 background information. Paragraphs 4 and 5, these</p> <p>22 paragraphs both relate to the published studies we were</p> <p>23 just discussing, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Paragraph 4 relates to Exhibit 3, whereas</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>1 A. I believe they knew that.</p> <p>2 Q. But there was no disclosure made?</p> <p>3 A. Not that I know of.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. I would like to look -- do you have</p> <p>5 your expert report with you today, sir?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 MR. STANSBURY: Could we mark that as an</p> <p>8 exhibit, please.</p> <p>9 MR. LEWIS: I've got one. What exhibit number</p> <p>10 are you going to put on it?</p> <p>11 (Document marked Deposition</p> <p>12 Exhibit No. 6 for identification.)</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Maybe I'll take this other, the</p> <p>14 other copy.</p> <p>15 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>16 Q. Before you is Exhibit 6. Is this your expert</p> <p>17 report, sir?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And does this opinion reflect the</p> <p>20 entirety of the opinions you intend to offer at the</p> <p>21 confirmation hearing?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Has there been any work done since the</p> <p>24 submission of this report that you believe informs the</p> <p>25 opinions that you wish to offer in this case?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 Paragraph 5 relates to Exhibit 4. Correct, sir?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And there's no reference in this report</p> <p>4 to Exhibit 5, the 2009 paper. That was published after</p> <p>5 this report, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. But do you intend to offer any opinions at the</p> <p>8 confirmation hearing based on that paper?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. So we can just put that aside, then,</p> <p>11 and not talk about it, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Fine.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Now, looking at Paragraph 6, Paragraph</p> <p>14 6 and 7, these discuss - and if you don't like my</p> <p>15 clarification, please tell me - these discuss the</p> <p>16 historical conditions at the mining and milling facility,</p> <p>17 correct, sir?</p> <p>18 A. Well, yeah. It discusses, you know, the basic</p> <p>19 flow of operations, flow of materials. And to that</p> <p>20 extent, I think you're correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Well, let's agree to a term that we can</p> <p>22 both be comfortable with. Paragraph 6 and 7 both relate</p> <p>23 to the historical operating conditions at Libby? Is</p> <p>24 that --</p> <p>25 A. Yes, again --</p>

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 Q. Okay.</p> <p>2 A. -- the way things were processed.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. And what --</p> <p>5 Q. So those were the historical conditions.</p> <p>6 Paragraph 8, tell me if I read this correctly:</p> <p>7 "The community of Libby lies in a mountain</p> <p>8 valley. The valley air shed functions somewhat like a</p> <p>9 bowl. Pollutants when disturbed by wind or human activity</p> <p>10 tend to be recycled into the bowl."</p> <p>11 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. That opinion relates to the atmospheric</p> <p>14 conditions in Libby, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Outdoor, right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Ambient air, is that another term for that as</p> <p>19 well?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, it could, I guess.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Do industrial hygienists typically</p> <p>22 study the ambient air?</p> <p>23 A. Well, the industrial hygienist is primarily</p> <p>24 concerned with what goes on inside the plant, but</p> <p>25 certainly we do become involved with public exposure</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 the atmosphere of other areas?</p> <p>2 A. I haven't personally, no.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Have you reviewed any literature which</p> <p>4 has studied the Libby atmosphere in that manner?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: As compared -- excuse me,</p> <p>6 Counsel. I don't mean to interfere, but when you say "in</p> <p>7 that manner," are you saying as compared to some other</p> <p>8 place?</p> <p>9 MR. STANSBURY: Yes.</p> <p>10 MR. LEWIS: Okay.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Well, yes, I have looked at</p> <p>12 literature describing that comparison.</p> <p>13 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Can you name any of the</p> <p>14 literature which --</p> <p>15 A. Well, I -- let me -- I guess maybe I better</p> <p>16 clarify. I mean I've looked at the literature that Tony</p> <p>17 Ward has put together where he looks at source</p> <p>18 apportionment; in other words, what's contributing to the</p> <p>19 particulates in the air in Libby. Is it automobile</p> <p>20 exhaust? Wood smoke? So from that standpoint, I've</p> <p>21 looked at that type of literature.</p> <p>22 Q. Is that a published paper?</p> <p>23 A. I don't know if it's published or not.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. I believe it is.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 because materials do move outside the plant. And so from</p> <p>2 that standpoint, I wouldn't be quite that narrow.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So when you say moving outside the</p> <p>4 plant, do you mean, you know, a cloud of dust moving down</p> <p>5 the street, or does that also involve atmospheric</p> <p>6 conditions, you know, thousands of feet in all directions?</p> <p>7 A. Well, probably not. I mean we certainly have</p> <p>8 to record, you know, atmospheric conditions when we're</p> <p>9 doing sampling. We want to know wind speeds and wind</p> <p>10 directions and pressures, temperatures, and things like</p> <p>11 that. So that's all atmospheric, I guess.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And the statement, "The valley airshed</p> <p>13 functions somewhat like a bowl," what is your basis for</p> <p>14 that opinion?</p> <p>15 A. Well, the basis for it is that there are a lot</p> <p>16 of inversions in Libby, I mean if you've ever been up</p> <p>17 there in the wintertime.</p> <p>18 Q. Oh, I have.</p> <p>19 A. And so it tends to have -- you know, the air</p> <p>20 tends to settle within the valley.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 A. That's all I meant there.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Have you ever studied systematically</p> <p>24 the extent to which any type of particulate or pollutant</p> <p>25 would remain static in the Libby atmosphere compared to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 Q. But that's something that informs your opinion</p> <p>2 as to whether the airshed functions somewhat like a bowl.</p> <p>3 It was Tony Ward's work, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Well, in part, yeah.</p> <p>5 Q. In part. Did that work examine asbestos in</p> <p>6 particular?</p> <p>7 A. Not that I'm aware.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. It focused on, I think you mentioned,</p> <p>9 automobile exhaust. Is that one of the potential</p> <p>10 substances?</p> <p>11 A. I believe so, wood smoke, and there were other</p> <p>12 things that they looked at.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. But you've not looked at any literature</p> <p>14 specific to how asbestos either remained or does not</p> <p>15 remain in the atmosphere in Libby, have you?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I've obviously looked at current studies</p> <p>17 being done by EPA as the technical advisor to the TAG.</p> <p>18 That's my job, is to, you know, evaluate what EPA is doing</p> <p>19 up there and to try to find out if, you know, if there's</p> <p>20 any problems with that. And so I do read their reports.</p> <p>21 I've read their ambient air sampling reports and different</p> <p>22 things.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. None of those reports, though, are</p> <p>24 cited in this, in this expert report, though, right?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Nor is the Tony Ward article, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And so when it says pollutants when</p> <p>4 disturbed by wind or human activity tend to be recycled in</p> <p>5 the bowl, that opinion is based also on Tony Ward's work</p> <p>6 as well as the EPA's work?</p> <p>7 A. Well, yes, in part, and just having been up</p> <p>8 there and just seeing how stagnant the air can be. So, I</p> <p>9 mean, that's the word "recycle." It's not going to move</p> <p>10 out of there very readily.</p> <p>11 Q. When you say just seeing the air, is that</p> <p>12 something that I would be just as capable of observing as</p> <p>13 you would, the stagnant air?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. That's not something that's based on an</p> <p>16 expertise that you have, correct?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Let's look at Paragraph 9, sir.</p> <p>19 Paragraph 9, and actually, I believe Paragraph 9, 10, and</p> <p>20 11, these paragraphs all seem to discuss ways in which</p> <p>21 people in the community may have been exposed to asbestos</p> <p>22 from the mining and milling facility; is that correct,</p> <p>23 sir?</p> <p>24 A. I believe that that would be correct in part,</p> <p>25 yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 asbestos in it, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Let's turn to Paragraph 13. Now,</p> <p>4 Paragraph 13, you're talking about the industrial hygiene</p> <p>5 literature, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And specifically, the literature is</p> <p>8 understanding of asbestos, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And you also mention that, and if I say this</p> <p>11 correctly: "The above was clear in the occupational</p> <p>12 medicine and industrial hygiene literature, and W.R. Grace</p> <p>13 and its predecessor Zonolite Company should have been well</p> <p>14 aware of it."</p> <p>15 Correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. So this one, it's not necessarily just</p> <p>18 historical conditions. We're also kind of talking here</p> <p>19 about what W.R. Grace or Zonolite should have known at the</p> <p>20 time, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And the way a company knows things, so to</p> <p>23 speak, is a function of its decision to gather</p> <p>24 information, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that these three</p> <p>2 paragraphs, 9, 10, and 11, they deal with potential</p> <p>3 community exposures?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Paragraph 12: Various tests on the</p> <p>6 dust showed 27 to 40 percent asbestos. You cite to common</p> <p>7 exhibits, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, common exhibits and, I mean, the</p> <p>9 percentages are also listed in, you know, publications</p> <p>10 like by EPA or ATSDR.</p> <p>11 Q. But these are historical measurements,</p> <p>12 correct? These weren't measurements that were done</p> <p>13 recently, correct?</p> <p>14 A. I believe they're historical.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And so they reflect the historical</p> <p>16 conditions that existed when the mine and the mill was</p> <p>17 operating, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Well, I'm not, I'm not sure how to answer your</p> <p>19 question. I mean the percentages, I don't know if they've</p> <p>20 changed. If they have, I don't know it.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay, okay.</p> <p>22 A. But, yeah, these do come from people looking</p> <p>23 historically at what's being reported.</p> <p>24 Q. Those were the conditions historically.</p> <p>25 Historically, 27 to 40 percent of the dust showed some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>1 Q. And that's an important part of being a</p> <p>2 responsible company in your mind, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Well, that's one way.</p> <p>4 Q. One way.</p> <p>5 A. Obviously, the other way is that someone gives</p> <p>6 them information --</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 A. -- and provides information to them.</p> <p>9 Q. But a company informing itself of potential</p> <p>10 hazards, that's part of a responsible company's code of</p> <p>11 conduct, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Please say that again.</p> <p>13 Q. Sure. A company informing themselves of</p> <p>14 potential hazards involving their enterprise, that is part</p> <p>15 of a responsible company's code of conduct, correct?</p> <p>16 MR. LEWIS: I'm going to object as -- I think</p> <p>17 the term "code of conduct" is vague. Without showing what</p> <p>18 you mean by that, I don't know how the witness can answer</p> <p>19 the question. I think the question is vague.</p> <p>20 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Do you understand my</p> <p>21 question, sir?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. You believe that companies can act</p> <p>24 responsible?</p> <p>25 A. I hope that they do, yes.</p>

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 Q. You believe companies can act irresponsibly,</p> <p>2 don't you?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. It's your opinion that Grace acted</p> <p>5 irresponsibly for many years with respect to the mining</p> <p>6 and milling operation in Libby, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you consider that irresponsibility to be a</p> <p>9 course of conduct that Grace took?</p> <p>10 A. I don't know what you mean by "course of</p> <p>11 conduct."</p> <p>12 Q. Do you -- well, we can come to an agreement on</p> <p>13 whatever words you want to use here. What I'm trying to</p> <p>14 get across, though, is this opinion - and there's going to</p> <p>15 be a lot of opinions in this report - really talks about</p> <p>16 what Grace should have known, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. What they should have done, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. What they didn't do, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Is there any way you would term -- is there</p> <p>23 any term you would use to describe those issues? I'm open</p> <p>24 to whatever term you want to use.</p> <p>25 A. Well, that's fine. We just mentioned them</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 question, sir?</p> <p>2 A. Well, yes. And by informing themselves</p> <p>3 meaning, you know, searching the literature for what's</p> <p>4 known about a particular topic like asbestos, conducting</p> <p>5 studies which are published and get the word out.</p> <p>6 Q. Right.</p> <p>7 A. Yeah, that's conduct.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So that's what Paragraph 13 --</p> <p>9 Paragraph 13, you know, addresses that. Paragraph 14, I'm</p> <p>10 going to read this out loud (quoted as read):</p> <p>11 "The central principles of industrial hygiene</p> <p>12 literature are to study, to warn and to protect. These</p> <p>13 principles extend not only to Grace workers in Libby, but</p> <p>14 also to family members of workers, and to the community.</p> <p>15 W.R. Grace and its predecessor Zonolite Company did not</p> <p>16 adequately study, warn or protect the workers, their</p> <p>17 families, or the community of Libby."</p> <p>18 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Again, this is an example where you</p> <p>21 believe Grace's conduct was improper with respect to the</p> <p>22 workers, the family members, and the community of Libby</p> <p>23 correct, sir?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Paragraph 15, this one's a little bit</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 individually, so --</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So, but they're actions, I mean these</p> <p>3 are all actions or inactions by Grace, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And can we use the term "conduct"? I</p> <p>6 mean is the term "conduct" comfortable to say that</p> <p>7 somebody's conduct is responsible when they put in a</p> <p>8 medical surveillance program? That's a form of conduct</p> <p>9 that's responsible, correct?</p> <p>10 A. That would be fine.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And, you know, not making any effort to</p> <p>12 keep a facility clean, that's irresponsible conduct,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And so I'm not trying to -- you know, I like</p> <p>16 the word "conduct" because it's easy. I just want to make</p> <p>17 sure we're on the same page here.</p> <p>18 Paragraph 13 talks about Grace's failure to -- or</p> <p>19 states what they should have known. And one way a company</p> <p>20 knows something is by informing itself, either somebody</p> <p>21 telling them or, you know, taking affirmative steps to</p> <p>22 learn, correct?</p> <p>23 MR. LEWIS: Objection; that's a compound</p> <p>24 question and it's improper.</p> <p>25 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Do you understand the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 longer. But again, is it fair to say, and this is -- you</p> <p>2 know, because you actually are quoting, I believe, Earl</p> <p>3 Lovick's deposition testimony, correct, from the</p> <p>4 Schnetter v. W.R. Grace transcript?</p> <p>5 MR. LEWIS: Objection; that's not correct.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Well, are we on 15?</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: That's his trial testimony.</p> <p>8 MR. STANSBURY: Oh, excuse me. Thank you,</p> <p>9 Tom, I appreciate that.</p> <p>10 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Paragraph 15 runs onto page</p> <p>11 7 all the way to page 8, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Fifteen, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And once again, here you are examining</p> <p>14 what Grace knew about the conditions in Libby. And as you</p> <p>15 state in the last sentence of the paragraph: "Grace</p> <p>16 continues to send men into the dry mill for eight years</p> <p>17 after 1966."</p> <p>18 Is that correct, sir?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So again, this speaks to Grace's, in your</p> <p>21 mind, improper conduct during this time period, correct,</p> <p>22 sir?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Moving on to Paragraph 16: "Grace knew</p> <p>25 of the connection between asbestos exposure and lung</p>

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>1 cancer through the 1964 State Report, and was therein</p> <p>2 informed of 'possible widespread carcinogenic air</p> <p>3 pollution'" - citation to Exhibit 53 - "Risks of asbestos</p> <p>4 to community members were quite clearly spelled out to</p> <p>5 Grace executives in 1968," again citing Exhibit 119.</p> <p>6 So here you believe that Grace was aware that there</p> <p>7 were community risks, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And Grace, in your mind, was not warning</p> <p>10 people about these risks, correct?</p> <p>11 A. That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q. So again, not proper conduct for a company</p> <p>13 like Grace, correct?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Paragraph 17, this to me looks more</p> <p>16 like discussions of the historical operations at Libby.</p> <p>17 Is that a fair description of Paragraph 17?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, the date 1967.</p> <p>19 Q. Right. And you're talking about the test was</p> <p>20 done in a large "600 fan" of the dry mill. So this</p> <p>21 doesn't necessarily speak to their conduct, but again as</p> <p>22 we were discussing earlier, speaks to what the conditions</p> <p>23 were historically, correct, sir?</p> <p>24 A. Well, it -- you know, if you read between the</p> <p>25 lines, it speaks of their conduct, too, because it was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 the air in Libby," Exhibit 20, expert report of</p> <p>2 Dr. Whitehouse.</p> <p>3 Now, this paragraph speaks more to potential</p> <p>4 community exposures, correct, sir?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Let's look at Paragraph 19. Again, I</p> <p>7 believe this paragraph speaks to Grace's conduct at the</p> <p>8 time, the last sentence being: "Accordingly, Grace's</p> <p>9 medical surveillance program was inadequate at all times</p> <p>10 up to 1990."</p> <p>11 Do you agree, sir?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Paragraph 20, again, this is -- does</p> <p>14 this deal with Grace's conduct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Paragraph 21, same question: Does this</p> <p>17 deal with Grace's conduct?</p> <p>18 A. (Perusing document) -- yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Paragraph 22, does this pertain to Grace's</p> <p>20 conduct?</p> <p>21 A. (Perusing document) -- yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Paragraph 23, does this relate to Grace's</p> <p>23 conduct?</p> <p>24 A. (Perusing document) -- yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Paragraph 24, does this relate to Grace's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 right in this time frame that the stack on the dry mill</p> <p>2 was horizontally located, so -- (pause.)</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So, again, in your mind, this is part</p> <p>4 of the conduct, then. You would put this under, again,</p> <p>5 another example where Grace's conduct was improper.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay, that's fair. Paragraph 18, here you're</p> <p>8 looking at - and I'm going to read this out, tell me if I</p> <p>9 read this correctly:</p> <p>10 "Residents have reported that Libby in</p> <p>11 1950-1990 was a dusty place. The manager of Grace</p> <p>12 operations estimated in 1965 that 'you could get a five</p> <p>13 count in downtown Libby on many dry days.'" Exhibit 79.</p> <p>14 This would have been 5 -- and could you please</p> <p>15 explain what "mppcf" means so we're clear?</p> <p>16 A. Million particles per cubic foot.</p> <p>17 Q. -- "or about 20 fibers per cubic centimeter."</p> <p>18 See Amandus (1987), citing Libby studies, expert report of</p> <p>19 Dr. Alan C. Whitehouse.</p> <p>20 "In 1975, Grace performed measurements of</p> <p>21 ambient air at three locations in Libby and obtained 0.67,</p> <p>22 1.1, and 1.5 f./cc" -- which is fibers per cubic</p> <p>23 centimeter. Is that correct, sir?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. -- "indicating a serious hazard from breathing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>1 conduct?</p> <p>2 A. (Perusing document) -- well, it pertains to</p> <p>3 their conduct and -- their conduct, and, you know, their</p> <p>4 knowledge.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And the knowledge that either informed</p> <p>6 or perhaps did not inform the conduct they took, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yeah, their knowledge of what was going on</p> <p>8 within their own plant.</p> <p>9 Q. Right. And as you say, Grace settled the</p> <p>10 case, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Where do I say that at -- yes, okay.</p> <p>12 Q. That's correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So that was the course of conduct they took</p> <p>15 was to settle the case, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes. In part, I believe that would be</p> <p>17 correct.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Paragraph 25, and I believe this</p> <p>19 relates to a study of workers. And again, you state:</p> <p>20 "This study was not disclosed." Is that correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And does that relate to Grace's conduct at the</p> <p>23 time?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, and state of the knowledge.</p> <p>25 Q. And state of knowledge. Paragraph 26, this is</p>

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">106</p> <p>1 a study of hamsters which, as you state, was not 2 disclosed. Does this relate to Grace's conduct and 3 knowledge at the time? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Okay. Paragraph 27, again, does this relate 6 to Grace's conduct? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. I'd like to read Paragraph 27 for the record. 9 Tell me if I read this correctly, please. 10 "In 1980 NIOSH proposed a study on Libby 11 workers. Grace's response was to consider alternatives, 12 including to 'obstruct and block'" - "obstruct and block" 13 in quotes - "the study." 14 Did I read that correctly, sir? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Now, ultimately, though, Grace cooperated with 17 NIOSH, didn't they? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And that study -- 20 A. Well, eventually NIOSH came into the plan, 21 sure. 22 Q. Right. However eventually, this proposed 23 study became the Amandus study, correct? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Okay. But you don't mention that below, do</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">108</p> <p>1 A. (Perusing document) -- yes. 2 Q. Now, Paragraph 33, this discusses the -- how 3 would you characterize Paragraph 33? 4 A. Let me read it. May I? 5 Q. Please do. 6 A. (Perusing document) -- it certainly pertains 7 to their knowledge. 8 Q. Ultimately -- okay, so it pertains to their 9 knowledge. So you would say -- or is it fair to say this 10 provides just background on the natural conditions in the 11 Libby area? 12 A. Well, it pertains to their conduct, too -- 13 Q. Okay. 14 A. -- because they're actually trying to market 15 this stuff. 16 Q. Fair, okay. And Paragraph 34, I'll read this 17 for the record (quoted as read): 18 "Grace knowingly endangered the health of 19 workers, family members of workers and community members 20 in Libby for decades. This constituted gross violations 21 of applicable industrial hygiene standards." 22 Did I read that correctly, sir? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. And that, of course, relates to their conduct, 25 does it not?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">107</p> <p>1 you? 2 A. No. 3 Q. Okay. Paragraph 28, again, does this relate 4 to Grace's conduct, historical conduct? 5 A. (Perusing document) -- yes. 6 Q. Okay. Paragraph 28 -- excuse me, Paragraph 7 29, does this relate to Grace's historical conduct? 8 A. (Perusing document) -- it relates to their 9 conduct, yes. 10 Q. Okay. Paragraph 30, does this relate to 11 Grace's historical conduct? 12 A. (Perusing document) -- yes. And in addition 13 to relating to their conduct, it relates to, you know, 14 what is done in the field of industrial hygiene, so just 15 so we're clear on that. 16 Q. Okay. No, that's fair. But what is done in 17 the field of industrial hygiene is, particularly at that 18 time, is certainly a relevant consideration when 19 evaluating their conduct, correct, sir? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Okay. Paragraph 31, once again, does this 22 relate to Grace's historical conduct? 23 A. (Perusing document) -- yes. 24 Q. Okay. Paragraph 32, does this relate to 25 Grace's historical conduct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">109</p> <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. The term "knowingly endangered," is that a 3 term that's often used in industrial hygiene? 4 A. Well, "knowingly" -- I mean they endangered 5 and they knew what was in this material, so they knowingly 6 endangered these people. 7 Q. Is that an opinion that you shared with Kris 8 McLean, that they had knowingly endangered these people? 9 A. I don't know if it was or not. 10 Q. Okay. Okay, Paragraph 35, is it fair to say 11 that this paragraph speaks generally about the history of 12 the medical community's understanding of asbestos disease? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. This is in no way specific to Grace, correct? 15 A. It speaks to the historical knowledge of. 16 Q. So arguably, this could be something which 17 could be used to evaluate their conduct because of what 18 they could have historically known, correct? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Okay. Paragraph 36, this paragraph speaks to 21 the, I would say, mineralogical content of the Libby 22 amphibole; is that correct? 23 A. Yes, and also knowledge about the toxicity of 24 at least part of that amphibole. 25 Q. "The Montana Supreme Court has found asbestos</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>1 dust was a well known toxic inhalant prior to 1956." Is</p> <p>2 that the portion that you say speaks to toxicity?</p> <p>3 A. Which paragraph are you on again?</p> <p>4 Q. Sure, 36, I'm reading in the middle of the</p> <p>5 paragraph.</p> <p>6 A. Oh, okay. Yeah, and the reference to Vorwald.</p> <p>7 Q. What is Vorwald?</p> <p>8 A. Vorwald essentially performed some</p> <p>9 toxicological studies on tremolite.</p> <p>10 Q. However, our understanding of the toxicity of</p> <p>11 tremolite today is more informed by studies performed by</p> <p>12 individuals such as Amandus, McDonald, Sullivan, or</p> <p>13 Lockey, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Well, considering the fact that we are looking</p> <p>15 at the different forms of amphibole in there, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So this paragraph speaks more to</p> <p>17 historical understanding, correct, as opposed to current</p> <p>18 understanding?</p> <p>19 MR. LEWIS: Objection, because if you read the</p> <p>20 rest of the paragraph, obviously, it talks about current</p> <p>21 understanding as I see it. So I think that misstates what</p> <p>22 the --</p> <p>23 MR. STANSBURY: Provided we're limiting this</p> <p>24 to toxicity. On the issue of toxicity, I see the Meeker</p> <p>25 study --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">112</p> <p>1 the record: "More recently, sophisticated analysis has</p> <p>2 shown that Libby asbestos is 84% winchite, 11% richterite,</p> <p>3 and 6% tremolite."</p> <p>4 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And as you stated, you're not a</p> <p>7 mineralogist, correct.</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. You're not a toxicologist, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. You don't have any opinions that go beyond</p> <p>12 what is available in the public literature with respect to</p> <p>13 the toxicology or mineralogy of the Libby fibers, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Paragraph 37, once again, this</p> <p>16 paragraph, similar to the ones before it, discusses the</p> <p>17 historical understanding by the medical community of</p> <p>18 potential health risks caused by asbestos, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Well, the health risks -- I'll read that</p> <p>20 again. (Perusing document) -- yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And similarly, Paragraph 38 also refers</p> <p>22 to historical knowledge of the health effects from</p> <p>23 exposure to asbestos, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And Paragraph 39 also refers to the historical</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">111</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: Why don't you restate your</p> <p>2 question --</p> <p>3 MR. STANSBURY: Yeah, maybe --</p> <p>4 MR. LEWIS: -- and I won't object if that's</p> <p>5 what you're limiting it to.</p> <p>6 MR. STANSBURY: Right, that's what I'm</p> <p>7 limiting it to.</p> <p>8 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) This, the discussion of</p> <p>9 toxicity in this paragraph speaks to when the medical</p> <p>10 community first became aware that tremolite was toxic but</p> <p>11 is not necessarily the authoritative source today for</p> <p>12 determining the toxicity of these fibers, correct?</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Of asbestos -- of Libby fibers?</p> <p>14 MR. STANSBURY: Of Libby fibers.</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Okay. No objection.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Well, yeah, the reference to</p> <p>17 Vorwald talks about the toxicity as evaluated through tox</p> <p>18 studies in his lab in 1951. But that, by no means, was</p> <p>19 the only discussion of the hazards of --</p> <p>20 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Right.</p> <p>21 A. -- or the toxicity of tremolite prior to that.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And then you also cite to Meeker in</p> <p>23 this paragraph, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And for the purpose of -- I'll read this for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">113</p> <p>1 understanding of health effects associated with exposure</p> <p>2 to asbestos, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And Paragraph 40 also refers to the historical</p> <p>5 understanding of medical literature with the caveat here</p> <p>6 that you mentioned industrial hygienists often review this</p> <p>7 literature, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. If I could read Paragraph 40 for the</p> <p>10 record:</p> <p>11 "By the 1960s, hundreds of articles and</p> <p>12 studies published in the industrial hygiene and medical</p> <p>13 literature established that asbestos exposure is harmful</p> <p>14 and can be fatal. These materials were readily available</p> <p>15 to anyone interested in learning about the dangers of</p> <p>16 asbestos. As a standard practice, industrial hygienists</p> <p>17 review industrial hygiene literature, as well as</p> <p>18 occupational medicine literature."</p> <p>19 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So once again, we're speaking about the</p> <p>22 state as of the 1960s, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Paragraph 41, this paragraph speaks</p> <p>25 about historical conditions but specifically discusses</p>

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">114</p> <p>1 potential community exposures arising out of the</p> <p>2 historical conditions, correct, sir?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. It's speaking to the, you know, the</p> <p>4 aerodynamic properties of asbestos and how it can expose</p> <p>5 people who are not directly working with the material.</p> <p>6 Q. In Paragraph 42 --</p> <p>7 A. It also speaks -- if I may interrupt for just</p> <p>8 a second --</p> <p>9 Q. Sure.</p> <p>10 A. -- it also speaks to control.</p> <p>11 Q. Historical control?</p> <p>12 A. Well, it's -- the same controls we use now are</p> <p>13 what was used historically, so -- (pause.)</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. But obviously because we're talking</p> <p>15 about Libby, we're talking about historical operation</p> <p>16 because it hasn't been operation for, I guess, 18 - 19</p> <p>17 years, correct?</p> <p>18 A. That's fine.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. In Paragraph 42, I'm going to read the</p> <p>20 first sentence: "Asbestos fibers in the air are known to</p> <p>21 travel long distances from their source or point of</p> <p>22 origin."</p> <p>23 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And then you cite to the Environmental</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">116</p> <p>1 Q. Has our understanding of how asbestos fibers</p> <p>2 behaved in the air changed in any way in the last 31</p> <p>3 years?</p> <p>4 A. Very little if at all.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, okay. So again, this paragraph would</p> <p>6 speak to, you know, ultimately would speak to the</p> <p>7 potential for exposure in the community, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, bystander exposure, I think.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay, okay. Paragraph 43, does that similarly</p> <p>10 speak to the potential exposure of a bystander?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay.</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Counsel, I'm not trying to be</p> <p>14 difficult here, but "bystander" has legal connotations as</p> <p>15 well, like a bystander liability, and I'm a little</p> <p>16 concerned about that. So I don't want to interrupt your</p> <p>17 examination. I think I understand what you mean by</p> <p>18 "bystander", but if you don't, on my examination, I'll ask</p> <p>19 the witness his understanding of bystander.</p> <p>20 If you could clear that up now, I think that</p> <p>21 might be helpful.</p> <p>22 MR. STANSBURY: Okay.</p> <p>23 MR. LEWIS: It's up to you.</p> <p>24 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) I'm getting "bystander</p> <p>25 exposure" from your report. That's in Paragraph 43; is it</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">115</p> <p>1 Protection Agency, and you say as follows, which states as</p> <p>2 follows:</p> <p>3 "During the time that the asbestos fiber</p> <p>4 remains airborne, it is able to move laterally with air</p> <p>5 currents and contaminate spaces distant from the point of</p> <p>6 release. Significant levels of contamination have been</p> <p>7 documented hundreds of meters from a point source of</p> <p>8 asbestos fibers, and fibers also move across contamination</p> <p>9 barrier symptoms with the passage of workers during</p> <p>10 removal of material.</p> <p>11 "The theoretical times needed for such</p> <p>12 respirable fibers to settle from a 3 meter ceiling are 4,</p> <p>13 20 and 80 hours in still air. Turbulence will prolong the</p> <p>14 settling and also cause reentrainment of fallen fibers,'</p> <p>15 (Sprayed Asbestos Containing Materials in Buildings, A</p> <p>16 Guidance Document, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,</p> <p>17 March 1978)."</p> <p>18 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So this is a cite to an EPA source a little</p> <p>21 over 30 years ago, correct?</p> <p>22 A. In 1978, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Discussing how asbestos fibers travel,</p> <p>24 correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">117</p> <p>1 not?</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. And what do you mean by "bystander exposure"?</p> <p>4 A. "Bystander" would mean, again, someone who is</p> <p>5 not working directly with the material, but they're doing</p> <p>6 something else at distances away from that job.</p> <p>7 Q. Right.</p> <p>8 A. So that's what I mean by "bystander."</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. It's kind of a loose term, I guess.</p> <p>11 Q. Sure.</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Counsel, for allowing</p> <p>13 that clarification.</p> <p>14 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Paragraph 44, I think this</p> <p>15 paragraph relates to general principles of industrial</p> <p>16 hygiene, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. It's not specific to Libby in any way, is it</p> <p>19 not?</p> <p>20 A. It's general industrial hygiene principles.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Paragraph 45, does this relate to the</p> <p>22 historical conditions and operations of the Libby</p> <p>23 vermiculite mine?</p> <p>24 A. (Perusing document) -- in part, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. What else does it relate to?</p>

30 (Pages 114 to 117)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">118</p> <p>1 A. Yeah, it relates to percentages, basically, in 2 the materials, so it would be historical.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And Paragraph 46, reading the first 4 sentence, "Soil containing Libby asbestos at levels equal 5 to or greater than 1% are generally considered a health 6 hazard requiring remediation," did I read that correctly, 7 sir?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. What is your basis for that sentence?</p> <p>10 A. My basis for that sentence is published 11 studies from EPA, Atkinson's, I think, study. I think 12 they might be listed in here.</p> <p>13 Q. Is it --</p> <p>14 A. NIOSH; there's a series of articles that 15 discuss this 1 percent issue, if that's what we want 16 to --</p> <p>17 Q. Is it a federally mandated action level? Is 18 that your understanding?</p> <p>19 A. And we're talking about the 1 percent?</p> <p>20 Q. Yes, yes.</p> <p>21 A. The 1 percent is a, is a percentage which 22 would be considered asbestos containing for removal, I 23 guess would be the best way to describe it.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. As an industrial hygienist, is it 25 common for you to examine the asbestos content of soil?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">120</p> <p>1 Libby; Atkinson's; NIOSH considers it to be a friable 2 material where if not bound up in anything, it's going to 3 be released from the material that it's contained in. The 4 fibers are all loose.</p> <p>5 Q. You say: "A review of the literature." Prior 6 to working with Libby, had you ever studied the propensity 7 of asbestos to be released from soil?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Had you ever studied releases of any 10 hazard from soil?</p> <p>11 A. From soil, no.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So soil analysis was not something that 13 you had previously done until you got involved with Libby 14 correct?</p> <p>15 A. That would be fair.</p> <p>16 Q. In your 20 -- how many years have you been an 17 industrial hygienist?</p> <p>18 A. I don't know; 30.</p> <p>19 Q. Thirty years, okay. So dealing with soil was 20 not something that you had dealt with previously.</p> <p>21 A. Well, you know, I hate to be limited. I mean 22 I've been involved with looking at asbestos levels in 23 dust, in other words. I don't know if you want to call 24 that "soil," but soil -- I'm trying to think if I've done 25 soil work previous to the Libby work, and I can't remember</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">119</p> <p>1 A. Well, we have -- or I have. It could be one 2 of our tasks, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you have any training studying the 4 propensity of asbestos fibers to be released from soil?</p> <p>5 A. Well, we've -- again, the literature tells us 6 how it could be released from soils. In terms of my 7 personal experience, yeah, we've collected soil samples 8 for asbestos and -- (pause.)</p> <p>9 Q. So you did examination of - and maybe I'm 10 using this term incorrectly - "bulk material," correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. That's distinct, though, from doing 13 airborne measurements, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion as to the 16 propensity of asbestos in soil to be released into the 17 ambient air?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. What is your opinion?</p> <p>20 A. My opinion is that amphibole asbestos from 21 Libby can be released into the air if it is contained in 22 low, very low percentages within the soil; very clear.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And what is your basis for that 24 opinion?</p> <p>25 A. Again, studies that have been done by EPA in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>1 if I'm looking at dust levels or levels that are contained 2 in the dust on a surface, or something like that.</p> <p>3 Q. For example, settled dust that has settled on 4 a surface of part of an industrial facility? Is that what 5 you're talking about?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 A. Or a home or something like that.</p> <p>9 Q. Right. But that is distinct from soil, is it 10 not?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And the tendency of an asbestos fiber 13 to be released from a flat surface is certainly different 14 than a tendency of an asbestos fiber to be released from 15 soil, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Well, it could be. I think it's all related 17 to activity.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. What activities have you personally 19 done to determine the tendency of asbestos to be released 20 from soil?</p> <p>21 A. Well, what activities have I done -- I mean 22 we're currently involved with a research project where 23 we're analyzing surface dust in homes that contain 24 vermiculite attic insulation. We are taking air samples 25 at the same time. So we're trying to establish if there</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 is a risk from surface contamination as to an airborne 2 exposure. So that's the work I've done.</p> <p>3 Q. But that's not soil. That is asbestos within 4 a home. That's not asbestos that is in the soil on the 5 ground, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Right, it's in a house or --</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And that's what industrial hygienists 8 tend to look at is soil within -- excuse me. Strike that.</p> <p>9 Industrial hygienists tend to examine asbestos 10 within a facility or on a settled surface, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Well, no, I wouldn't say that. I mean you 12 could have an industrial facility where they're doing a 13 removal job like asbestos siding. And obviously, the soil 14 is contaminated from that siding, so we would look at 15 soil. And we've done that up at Montana Tech.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. But the question I had asked earlier, 17 which elicited the response regarding the work you've done 18 in homes, was what work you have done studying the release 19 of asbestos from soil in Libby.</p> <p>20 A. Well, again, it would be the same sort of 21 situation where -- an industrial hygienist would be 22 concerned about a release into any media, whether it be 23 soil or dust, and we certainly take air samples in 24 conjunction with that. So whether or not we can establish 25 a relationship between what's in the soil or the media and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 accurately. And that's the problem here. If you're going 2 to load up your questions by your own paraphrase of his 3 testimony and -- that's deceptive questioning and that's 4 what I object to here.</p> <p>5 MR. STANSBURY: Okay. Let's get back to -- 6 let's refocus on that for a moment.</p> <p>7 Could you read the last pending question, 8 please.</p> <p>9 (The record was read by the court reporter as 10 follows:</p> <p>11 "QUESTION: So sitting here today, you're not 12 aware of any reliable source that would allow us to 13 determine the potential airborne releases from asbestos in 14 soil?")</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm aware of studies that 16 have been done and are being done by the EPA in Libby 17 where they are evaluating release of asbestos fibers from 18 soil.</p> <p>19 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Other than those studies, anything 21 else?</p> <p>22 A. Not that I can think of right now.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. So let's talk about those studies, 24 then. Are these studies that are ongoing now?</p> <p>25 A. Well, they're doing activity-based sampling in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 the air is another question, but we certainly look at 2 those aspects.</p> <p>3 Q. I understand looking at the aspect, but 4 sitting here today, have you derived a relationship from 5 your work that compares the amount of asbestos in soil 6 with the amount of asbestos that's released into the air 7 when the soil is disrupted?</p> <p>8 A. Well, no, that's work that's ongoing right now 9 in Libby. No one had that relationship right now.</p> <p>10 Q. So sitting in here, sitting here today, you're 11 not aware of any reliable source that would allow us to 12 determine the potential airborne releases from asbestos in 13 soil?</p> <p>14 MR. LEWIS: I'm going to object to the form of 15 the question because I think that assumes -- misstates the 16 witness evidence in the sense that he was talking about 17 quantification as to whether or not there were such 18 releases, but -- so I think the question assumes facts not 19 in evidence.</p> <p>20 MR. STANSBURY: I think you could say "assumes 21 facts not in evidence" without coaching the witness. I 22 would appreciate doing so next time.</p> <p>23 You may answer.</p> <p>24 MR. LEWIS: Well, I would appreciate, Counsel, 25 that when you restate his testimony, you restate it</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>1 Libby right now, in Libby and up at the mine.</p> <p>2 Q. Um-hmm.</p> <p>3 A. Paul Peronard did the initial studies in the 4 early '90s in Libby where they did activity-based sampling 5 to try to determine what is coming off gardening, 6 driveways, working with soils as well as other types of 7 media, sure.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Did you rely upon those results in 9 formulating your opinions regarding the hazards from 10 asbestos in soil in Libby?</p> <p>11 A. Yes. This 1 percent issue, yes, I've relied 12 on that.</p> <p>13 Q. Specifically, you relied upon the studies done 14 by EPA, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yeah, I relied on the knowledge I have accrued 16 in reading EPA documents both before I became a technical 17 advisor for the TAG and after.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And which -- by "EPA documents," we're 19 talking about post 1999 EPA documents, correct, the ones 20 that deal with the studies that you're referencing?</p> <p>21 Those all began when Paul Peronard came to Libby in 22 November of '99, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. So with respect to those post 1999 EPA 25 studies, which ones have been published?</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>1 A. Well, they're published by EPA, I guess. I</p> <p>2 don't know how to answer your question. I'm trying to</p> <p>3 look -- yeah, like they're referencing the Christopher</p> <p>4 Weis memorandum is referenced in Paragraph 48, so those</p> <p>5 are the types of things I'm referring to.</p> <p>6 Q. The Christopher Weis memorandum, so we're</p> <p>7 clear, the one in Paragraph 48 that relates to -- now I'm</p> <p>8 going to read the statement that you have citing that and</p> <p>9 let me know if I read it correctly:</p> <p>10 "These results clearly indicate that</p> <p>11 vermiculite insulation in homes or commercial buildings is</p> <p>12 a substantial reservoir of asbestos-contaminated source</p> <p>13 material that may lead to ongoing exposure of area</p> <p>14 residents and workers."</p> <p>15 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. So he's talking about, again, asbestos</p> <p>18 in homes and in commercial buildings, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, as part of the work that was done up</p> <p>20 there by Peronard and others, looking at exposure levels</p> <p>21 that are coming from soil and different sort of things</p> <p>22 based on activities that are being done.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. But that citation here that you list,</p> <p>24 this is not speaking about soils specifically, is it not?</p> <p>25 A. If you read the citation, I think you will</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>1 Q. Right.</p> <p>2 A. -- number, but -- (pause.)</p> <p>3 Q. Were these memoranda cited in your report?</p> <p>4 A. I don't know if they're cited in my report or</p> <p>5 not. They may not be.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Sitting here today, were these</p> <p>7 memoranda included among your reliance materials?</p> <p>8 A. Yes. Well, I mean, it's like I say, I'm</p> <p>9 trying to include --</p> <p>10 Q. Well, did you produce copies? Are you aware</p> <p>11 of whether copies of these memoranda were produced to us?</p> <p>12 A. I'm not aware of that.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay.</p> <p>14 A. You were asking me about my knowledge of soil</p> <p>15 and release of asbestos from the soil.</p> <p>16 Q. Understood. So clearly, you clearly relied on</p> <p>17 these memoranda in reaching this opinion, correct?</p> <p>18 A. I've relied on all of the documents that I've</p> <p>19 read over the years pertaining to potential of release</p> <p>20 from soils into the air.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And so far we've listed the Chris Weis</p> <p>22 memoranda; the EPA studies that look at indoor air that, I</p> <p>23 believe you said, inferred that the indoor air was a</p> <p>24 result of asbestos being blown in from the soil. Is that</p> <p>25 correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>1 find that it's talking about soil, but -- if you read the</p> <p>2 paper.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say, then, that one</p> <p>4 item we have identified that informs your opinion about</p> <p>5 the potential release of asbestos from soil is the Chris</p> <p>6 Weis action memorandum?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Anything else?</p> <p>9 A. Well, there's been more recent publications by</p> <p>10 EPA in the later time period where they are -- where</p> <p>11 they've collected indoor air samples at a given period in</p> <p>12 time, and then they've gone back and collected indoor air</p> <p>13 samples later on. And they are attributing in their</p> <p>14 documents to this increase in indoor air asbestos at a</p> <p>15 later date due to the soil, the soil contamination. So</p> <p>16 that informs my opinion.</p> <p>17 Q. How would indoor air be related to releases</p> <p>18 from soil?</p> <p>19 A. Because it blows into the house. I'm not</p> <p>20 talking, you know, anything too complicated here.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So -- and when was this study</p> <p>22 conducted?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I think there's been some done in the</p> <p>24 early, well, probably 2005 - 2006. There are technical</p> <p>25 memorandums. I can't quote them by --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>1 A. I believe that's what they concluded.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Are there any other sources that inform</p> <p>3 your opinion as to the propensity of asbestos be released</p> <p>4 from soil?</p> <p>5 A. Well, again, there's other citations: EPA</p> <p>6 2001, EPA 2004.</p> <p>7 Q. I'm sorry, which page are we on?</p> <p>8 A. I was looking under Paragraph 46.</p> <p>9 Q. The ones that speak to the --</p> <p>10 A. It begins with soil containing Libby asbestos.</p> <p>11 Q. Sitting here today, are you aware of a</p> <p>12 correlation between asbestos and soil and the amount of</p> <p>13 asbestos that can be released into the air?</p> <p>14 A. Well, that's a question mark.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So that's certainly something you</p> <p>16 cannot say reliably that "X" level of asbestos in the soil</p> <p>17 will produce "Y" level of asbestos in the air, correct?</p> <p>18 A. That would be correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay.</p> <p>20 MR. LEWIS: Is it a good time for a break?</p> <p>21 MR. STANSBURY: Yeah, let's take a break.</p> <p>22 That's fine.</p> <p>23 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:08. We're off</p> <p>24 of the record.</p> <p>25 (The lunch recess was taken.)</p>

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">130</p> <p>1 VIDEOGRAPHER: This is Tape 3 of the</p> <p>2 videotaped deposition of Dr. Terry Spear.</p> <p>3 The time is 11:47. We're on the record.</p> <p>4 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Dr. Spear, can we move to Paragraph 52,</p> <p>6 please. And in 52 and 53, there are statements here</p> <p>7 regarding the toxicity of asbestos from Libby; is that</p> <p>8 correct, sir?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And once again, you are not a toxicologist,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q. You don't intend to offer any specific</p> <p>14 opinions about toxicity at the confirmation hearing, do</p> <p>15 you?</p> <p>16 A. I cannot offer any opinions on toxicology, no.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Dr. Spear, have you reviewed the</p> <p>18 Amandus paper, 1987?</p> <p>19 A. I have at one point in time, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Who is Harlan Amandus?</p> <p>21 A. I'm sorry, who is he?</p> <p>22 Q. Yeah. Do you know who he is?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. You've never met him before?</p> <p>25 A. I've never met him.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">132</p> <p>1 correct?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Because in order to determine something like</p> <p>4 toxicity, you need to know information about exposure,</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And this is clearly the paper of the</p> <p>8 three most relevant to your area of expertise, is it not?</p> <p>9 A. I'm sorry, by "three" --</p> <p>10 Q. You're aware that there was a mortality study</p> <p>11 and a morbidity study also done by Amandus, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And so the papers that look at, those</p> <p>14 papers, the morbidity study, are you familiar with that?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. That looked at radiographic</p> <p>17 abnormalities in the working population and correlated</p> <p>18 that to exposures, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. The mortality study looked at mortality within</p> <p>21 a worker cohort and correlated that with exposure,</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Both papers were dependent upon the exposure</p> <p>25 data contained in this paper, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">131</p> <p>1 Q. You are aware that he was working at NIOSH at</p> <p>2 the time he wrote that paper, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. NIOSH is the National Institute of</p> <p>5 Occupational Safety and Health; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And that is part of the United States</p> <p>8 Government, is it not?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 (Document marked Deposition</p> <p>11 Exhibit No. 7 for identification.)</p> <p>12 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. I'm handing you what's been marked as</p> <p>14 Exhibit 7. Exhibit 7 is "The Morbidity and Mortality of</p> <p>15 Vermiculite Miners and Millers Exposed to Tremolite: Part</p> <p>16 I. Exposure Estimates"; authors: Amandus, Wheeler,</p> <p>17 Jankovic, and Tucker; published in 1987 in the American</p> <p>18 Journal of Industrial Medicine.</p> <p>19 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And do you -- is this familiar with</p> <p>22 you? Do you recognize this document?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. This is the paper by Amandus that</p> <p>25 specifically focuses on establishing the exposures,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">133</p> <p>1 A. That's correct.</p> <p>2 Q. And of the three papers, this is the paper</p> <p>3 that primary falls within your area of expertise, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Well, in terms of exposure measurement, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Yes, okay. And do you have any general</p> <p>6 opinions regarding this paper?</p> <p>7 A. Well, I've read this paper, you know,</p> <p>8 associated with other W.R. Grace cases, and my general</p> <p>9 opinion pertaining to any exposure measurements at the</p> <p>10 mine site, or it may be if it was done outside the mine</p> <p>11 site in Libby, is that during this time frame, they were</p> <p>12 basically looking at PCM analysis. And in my opinion, the</p> <p>13 fibers that were less than 5 micrometers in length are not</p> <p>14 being factored into the exposure.</p> <p>15 Q. Five micrometers or five microns?</p> <p>16 A. The same thing: Microns/micrometers.</p> <p>17 Q. Micrometers is the same -- okay, got it.</p> <p>18 So you believe that this paper should have looked at</p> <p>19 fibers with -- that were less than 5 microns in length,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yeah. As an industrial hygienist, my opinion</p> <p>22 is that the -- that fibers shorter than 5 micrometers can</p> <p>23 be toxic, but we don't know that they're not toxic. And</p> <p>24 I'm uncomfortable with not considering that in either risk</p> <p>25 assessment, or evaluation, or what have you.</p>

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 Q. Are you aware of other epidemiological studies</p> <p>2 that only counted fibers longer than 5 microns in length?</p> <p>3 A. That's been the standard practice.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So this paper is in no way an outlier,</p> <p>5 so to speak, insofar as they only counted fibers longer</p> <p>6 than 5 micrometers, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Correct.</p> <p>8 Q. It's just something that you personally,</p> <p>9 Dr. Spear, do not agree with, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Well, not just me personally, but there's an</p> <p>11 accumulating -- I mean I think that, hopefully, the risk</p> <p>12 of asbestos will eventually look at short fibers, not just</p> <p>13 long fibers. The reason that they were looking at long</p> <p>14 fibers was simply due to the analytical sensitivity of the</p> <p>15 method. OSHA's current standard of 0.1 fibers per cc is</p> <p>16 that level because that is the level of analytical</p> <p>17 sensitivity; in other words, we have no reliability if</p> <p>18 we're trying to quantify fibers at lower levels. And so</p> <p>19 hopefully as technology increases and we can start more</p> <p>20 consistently evaluating all fibers, then the risk will</p> <p>21 take into account short fibers. That's my opinion.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So, you know, we've already</p> <p>23 established, correct, that it is common in industrial</p> <p>24 hygiene literature to report only those asbestos fibers</p> <p>25 that are longer than 5 microns in length, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. When they died, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And information related to that. And that</p> <p>5 mortality, it becomes -- is compared to their exposure in</p> <p>6 order to drive the toxicity of the substance, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And so if you were to do an analysis</p> <p>9 looking at fibers at level "X", given a certain level of</p> <p>10 the mortality, and then you were to derive a toxicity</p> <p>11 factor - we can assume that you've just done that for a</p> <p>12 moment because I don't want to ask too long of a question</p> <p>13 - but that makes sense, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Kind of, I guess.</p> <p>15 Q. Well, determining -- let me make sure we're on</p> <p>16 the same page. You determine toxicity based on certain</p> <p>17 exposure levels, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, and length of exposure.</p> <p>19 Q. And length of exposure. So you get cumulative</p> <p>20 exposure, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. So if the exposure levels are higher at the</p> <p>23 same length of exposure, you're going to have higher</p> <p>24 cumulative exposure, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. However, if you were to report all</p> <p>3 fibers, including those that are less than 5 microns, that</p> <p>4 would, typically, have the effect to increase the amount</p> <p>5 of fibers that are counted, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So the exposures would appear higher,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Well, it would be representative of what a</p> <p>10 person breathes in, whether they're short fibers or long</p> <p>11 fibers, yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. But just to make sure we're clear, so</p> <p>13 let's say somebody had 5 fibers per cc only counting</p> <p>14 fibers that were 5 microns or longer, if you were to count</p> <p>15 all fibers, you would expect that person to have a higher</p> <p>16 exposure measurement, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And although we discussed earlier</p> <p>19 you're not a toxicologist or an epidemiologist, but as an</p> <p>20 industrial hygienist, you do understand how exposure</p> <p>21 quantifications fit into a toxicology analysis, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And one of the data points, for</p> <p>24 example, on a mortality study would be actual mortality,</p> <p>25 the people who have died, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>1 Q. And thank you for pointing this out. It's</p> <p>2 that accumulative exposure that is then used and compared</p> <p>3 against mortality to derive the toxicity of the substance,</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And that's not specific to asbestos. This is</p> <p>7 the way you would approach any type of exposure to a</p> <p>8 hazard if you wanted to derive the toxicity, correct?</p> <p>9 A. That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. So if you were to -- when evaluating</p> <p>11 that initial exposure, if you were to include additional</p> <p>12 fibers, let's say shorter fibers, that would give you a</p> <p>13 higher exposure measurement, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And over the same duration, a higher</p> <p>16 cumulative exposure, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. So if you were looking at the exact same</p> <p>19 analysis, although now you have higher cumulative</p> <p>20 exposures, that would show a lower level of toxicity for</p> <p>21 the substance, would it not?</p> <p>22 A. It could, but I don't think the same points</p> <p>23 apply to morbidity, either, or disease rates, you know, in</p> <p>24 a person, what rates actually cause disease prior to</p> <p>25 mortality.</p>

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">138</p> <p>1 Q. I'm sorry, I don't follow.</p> <p>2 A. Well, I just -- I don't agree with that same</p> <p>3 philosophy in terms of you're talking about mortality</p> <p>4 studies or people dying from asbestos. I think that to</p> <p>5 determine risk of asbestos exposure in causing disease, I</p> <p>6 do think that we have to consider total exposure.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And I'm not contesting that at this</p> <p>8 moment. But looking at total exposure, if you do get</p> <p>9 higher exposure because you're counting additional fibers</p> <p>10 and you use that number to determine cumulative exposure,</p> <p>11 the toxicity of the substance will be lower, assuming that</p> <p>12 the mortality end points are the same, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Because of using -- I understand your point.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And just so I make sure I understand my</p> <p>15 own point, to the extent that Dr. Amandus, working for</p> <p>16 NIOSH, may have excluded fibers shorter than 5 microns,</p> <p>17 that would have the impact of increasing the toxicity of</p> <p>18 the Libby amphiboles based on the findings of the study,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 MR. LEWIS: Hold on. I object to that</p> <p>21 question. That question is very ambiguous. What's the</p> <p>22 antecedent for the pronoun "that" in your question?</p> <p>23 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Dr. Spear, you seem to</p> <p>24 understand the question.</p> <p>25 MR. LEWIS: Well, the question -- that doesn't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">140</p> <p>1 have followed your suggested method of counting all</p> <p>2 fibers, correct?</p> <p>3 A. It could have that effect.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Other than the exclusion of fibers</p> <p>5 shorter than 5 microns, are there any other statements in</p> <p>6 Dr. Amandus's paper or any other findings that you find to</p> <p>7 be unsupportable scientifically?</p> <p>8 A. Well, no. It was a peer-reviewed article and,</p> <p>9 certainly, it's been referenced and cited many times.</p> <p>10 There's always questions on exposure reconstruction.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay.</p> <p>12 A. Things like that.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. I wanted to walk through a couple parts</p> <p>14 of this paper, then. And starting on page 2, under</p> <p>15 "Exposure Measurements":</p> <p>16 "Samples of airborne dust have been taken in</p> <p>17 the mill since 1942 and in the mine since 1968. Prior to</p> <p>18 1969, 336 midget impinger samples were collected by the</p> <p>19 state of Montana primarily in the dry mill, and after</p> <p>20 1967, 4116 membrane filter samples of airborne dust were</p> <p>21 collected by federal agencies (NIOSH, MESA, and MSHA)"</p> <p>22 NIOSH, MESA, and MSHA, just so the court reporter is clear</p> <p>23 - "and the company in most areas of the facility (Table</p> <p>24 II). Before 1974, filter samples were either general area</p> <p>25 or short-term personal samplings collected over periods</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">139</p> <p>1 make any difference whether -- if the question is</p> <p>2 improper, it's improper. It's misleading, it's vague,</p> <p>3 it's also compound.</p> <p>4 MR. STANSBURY: I'll ask you to, again, not</p> <p>5 coach the witness.</p> <p>6 MR. LEWIS: I didn't coach the witness. What</p> <p>7 did I say to the witness there, Counsel?</p> <p>8 MR. STANSBURY: Could you please read back the</p> <p>9 last question, madam court reporter?</p> <p>10 (The record was read by the court reporter as</p> <p>11 follows:</p> <p>12 "QUESTION: And just so I make sure I</p> <p>13 understand my own point, to the extent that Dr. Amandus,</p> <p>14 working for NIOSH, may have excluded fibers shorter</p> <p>15 than" --</p> <p>16 MR. STANSBURY: Let me try to ask the question</p> <p>17 in a way that will, you know, address everybody's</p> <p>18 concerns.</p> <p>19 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>20 Q. To the extent that Dr. Amandus, working for</p> <p>21 NIOSH, may have under-counted fibers by excluding fibers</p> <p>22 shorter than 5 microns, by doing so, given the mortality</p> <p>23 and morbidity end points he worked with, that would have</p> <p>24 the effect of reporting a toxicity factor in the Libby</p> <p>25 amphibole that actually may have been higher were he to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">141</p> <p>1 ranging from 20 minutes to several hours, and were not</p> <p>2 likely to have reflected the 8-hr TWA exposure."</p> <p>3 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you agree with this approach?</p> <p>6 A. Well, yes, because -- well, I agree. That</p> <p>7 approach does still take place today.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And MESA, M-E-S-A, that no longer</p> <p>9 exists by that name, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Right.</p> <p>11 Q. What did MESA stand for?</p> <p>12 A. The Mine Enforcement and Safety</p> <p>13 Administration, I think.</p> <p>14 Q. And that was a federal agency --</p> <p>15 A. Yeah.</p> <p>16 Q. -- correct --</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. -- or administration. And then MSHA, that's</p> <p>19 the successor to MESA?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And what does MSHA stand for?</p> <p>22 A. Mine Safety and Health Administration.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And if you could turn to Table III --</p> <p>24 or page 3, Table II, excuse me. "Table II. Description</p> <p>25 of Environmental Samples," this reflects where this data</p>

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">142</p> <p>1 in this paper was collected from, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And 789 of the samples from 1971 to 1981 were</p> <p>4 collected by MESA and/or MSHA, correct, sir?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>6 Q. Forty-eight of the samples from 1967 to '68</p> <p>7 were collected by NIOSH, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And then 336 samples using the mppcf</p> <p>10 measurement were collected from 1956 to 1969 by the State</p> <p>11 of Montana, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And so -- and then the company between 1970</p> <p>14 and 1982 collected 3,279 samples, correct?</p> <p>15 A. That's what the Table II says, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And again, this is a peer-reviewed</p> <p>17 study. You have no reason to dispute that, correct?</p> <p>18 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>19 Q. Again, this is a peer-reviewed study. You</p> <p>20 have no reason to dispute the findings of the table,</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. So it's fair to say that the exposure</p> <p>24 data underlying this study was based on a large number of</p> <p>25 samples, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>1 cause you to have less confidence in this paper?</p> <p>2 A. It could, well, particularly when workers --</p> <p>3 you know, if they're in and out of different locations and</p> <p>4 move a lot.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Do you believe they try to take into</p> <p>6 account the idea of individuals moving in and out of</p> <p>7 locations?</p> <p>8 A. I'm sure they did.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. On Table IV -- excuse me, page 4 Table</p> <p>10 III, now, this table summarizes the average fiber per cc</p> <p>11 values calculated from membrane filter samples collected</p> <p>12 in 1967 through 1962 by location, operation, and year,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. Um-hmm.</p> <p>15 Q. "Yes," sir?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And I want to look at a couple of these</p> <p>18 measurements. Specifically, the new wet mill, post '76,</p> <p>19 the average exposure was 0.8 fibers per cc, correct?</p> <p>20 A. I need to make sure I know where you're</p> <p>21 looking at again.</p> <p>22 Q. Sure.</p> <p>23 A. You're on Table III?</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. You're looking at new wet mill?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>1 A. There are a large number of samples, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Some of which were collected by the</p> <p>3 State of Montana, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And some by various federal agencies, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with how he derived</p> <p>8 the location operations approach to estimating exposures?</p> <p>9 A. I've looked at it before.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 A. I'm vaguely familiar with it.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Do you have any reason to believe that</p> <p>13 using location operations -- well, strike that.</p> <p>14 Is the use of location operations to estimate</p> <p>15 exposures within a facility a common practice in</p> <p>16 industrial hygiene?</p> <p>17 A. Well, we would typically nowadays try to</p> <p>18 divide work forces up into similar exposed groups. And</p> <p>19 they don't necessarily have to be in one location, they</p> <p>20 could be similar groups that work in different locations,</p> <p>21 but I believe this is a method that they used then.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And you consider it a reliable method?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I think "reliable" to as reliable as it</p> <p>24 can be.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Does the use of location operation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>1 Q. Yes, post '76, after '76.</p> <p>2 A. Oh, okay.</p> <p>3 Q. That's 0.8 fibers per cc, correct, sir?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And that's based on 1,214 samples, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall what the MSHA PEL was in 1976?</p> <p>8 A. I don't recall. It could have been 5. I know</p> <p>9 MSHA was always slower than OSHA in changing PEL --</p> <p>10 Q. Right.</p> <p>11 A. -- their limits.</p> <p>12 Q. Right. But it was certainly higher than 0.8,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, and it's -- but this number is certainly</p> <p>15 higher than the current, the current exposure limit,</p> <p>16 which --</p> <p>17 Q. The current OSHA PEL or MSHA PEL?</p> <p>18 A. The OSHA PEL.</p> <p>19 Q. Right. Is it your understanding that MSHA or</p> <p>20 OSHA was primarily responsible for regulating the mine?</p> <p>21 A. Well, I think for the mine itself, it was</p> <p>22 MSHA. And then for some of the in-town facilities, I</p> <p>23 believe OSHA would have had some jurisdiction. I've had</p> <p>24 this discussion --</p> <p>25 Q. Right.</p>

37 (Pages 142 to 145)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>1 A. -- before in depositions.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that for the mill</p> <p>3 associated with the mine, that would still fall under</p> <p>4 MSHA's jurisdiction?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And 1976 on, the PEL within that wet</p> <p>7 mill was below MSHA's PEL, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Moving on, sir, on page 5, there seems</p> <p>10 to be an issue with converting mppcf to fibers per cc,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And this is certainly an analysis that I</p> <p>14 believe requires some estimation, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Well, yes. It's very suspect, particularly</p> <p>16 unless all of the other sampling variables were the same.</p> <p>17 You know, I mean it's hard to apply that conversion across</p> <p>18 the board.</p> <p>19 Q. Right. So that conversion, though, would only</p> <p>20 have been used for samples that were created prior to</p> <p>21 1969, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Because after 1969, they're using fiber per</p> <p>24 cc, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">148</p> <p>1 V, which is the conversion ratio. This appears to be a</p> <p>2 matrix that compares measurements of mppcf to fibers per</p> <p>3 cc; is that correct, sir?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Have you ever seen the use of a matrix of this</p> <p>6 form before?</p> <p>7 A. Very seldom, I guess. Only in these earlier</p> <p>8 studies pertaining to the -- well, I'm sure it was done</p> <p>9 with other asbestos work, too.</p> <p>10 Q. Right. But it wouldn't be done nowadays</p> <p>11 because we're not using mppcf any more, are we?</p> <p>12 A. Right.</p> <p>13 Q. So during this period of transition was when</p> <p>14 these types of problems arose, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes. And the reason we aren't using million</p> <p>16 particles per cubic foot any more is because it was highly</p> <p>17 unreliable and it was very difficult to try to count</p> <p>18 asbestos fibers using that method, so it's certainly all</p> <p>19 very unreliable.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Have you ever relied upon a study that</p> <p>21 used mppcf in its measurements?</p> <p>22 A. No. I don't know what you mean.</p> <p>23 Q. Well, you say it's unreliable, measurements</p> <p>24 that are measured in mppcf. You were citing studies</p> <p>25 earlier in your expert report that were pre 1965 in some</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">147</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So to the extent there are any</p> <p>2 questions over this conversion, that would relate to</p> <p>3 pre-1969 exposures. Am I correct, sir?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, wherever they were using million</p> <p>5 particles per cubic foot.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And those exposures were very high,</p> <p>7 correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Nobody disputes that the exposures in the dry</p> <p>10 mill were well in excess of any PEL, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Say that again.</p> <p>12 Q. The exposures in the dry mill were, in some</p> <p>13 cases, over 100 fibers per cc, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And so while there may be some</p> <p>16 ambiguity in converting the mppcf to fibers per cc, we're</p> <p>17 still dealing with very large numbers, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. This is not an instance where we're trying to</p> <p>20 convert data and seeing whether it fits under a 0.1 or 0.5</p> <p>21 PEL. We're talking about data that involved measurements</p> <p>22 that are very high, even if there is some imprecision in</p> <p>23 the conversion, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And if we look on page 6, we see Table</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">149</p> <p>1 instances.</p> <p>2 A. Right.</p> <p>3 Q. Those studies would have used mppcf, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. So it's not as if Amandus was using data that</p> <p>6 nobody else had ever used in the published literature,</p> <p>7 correct?</p> <p>8 A. Well, right. That was the only choice we had.</p> <p>9 Q. Right. And given that, is the use of a matrix</p> <p>10 a reasonable means of trying to convert mppcf to fiber per</p> <p>11 cc?</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: You mean today? Give some time</p> <p>13 foundation. You said "is" rather than "was."</p> <p>14 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Well, we're never going to</p> <p>15 deal with any data post 1967 -- '69 or '70 that's in</p> <p>16 mppcf's. We're always talking about historical data, are</p> <p>17 we not?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So given -- dealing with this data in</p> <p>20 which you do have a comprehensive exposure analysis that</p> <p>21 goes in an era from mppcf to a time in which we're</p> <p>22 measuring in fiber per cc, is the use of a matrix a</p> <p>23 reasonable method for converting mppcf to fibers per cc?</p> <p>24 A. Yes. I think Amandus was trying to use</p> <p>25 historical data, as unreliable as it may be. In terms of</p>

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">150</p> <p>1 identifying fibers, he was trying to use it. He had 2 historical data that he was trying to use. 3 Q. Okay. And is that a reasonable method to do 4 so? 5 A. I'm sure it's been done before. 6 Q. Okay. So he's not an outlier in this regard? 7 A. No. 8 Q. Okay. And if you look on the bottom -- on the 9 middle of page 6, I guess it's the last sentence of the 10 first full paragraph, we see the line: "Due to the lack 11 of exposure data in these areas, estimates before 1968 are 12 considered 'guesstimates.'" 13 Did I read that correctly, sir? 14 A. I want to make sure I know where you're 15 reading that at. 16 Q. Sure; sure, sure. 17 A. Where, where were you at again? 18 Q. Oh, sure. I'm right here -- (indicating.) 19 A. So "due to the lack of exposure," that's where 20 you started? 21 Q. Yes, sir. 22 A. I do see that, yes. 23 Q. Okay. So he's certainly being very 24 forthcoming over some of the limitations of the data, 25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">152</p> <p>1 be, if I'm not mistaken, some effort to address the fact 2 that workers moved throughout the course of the day, 3 correct? 4 MR. LEWIS: I'm going to object. The question 5 is argumentative. The question is a paraphrase. It's not 6 a proper question. Object to the form of the question. 7 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Okay, you may answer, sir. 8 A. So we're referring to the last paragraph, 9 then? 10 Q. Yes. 11 A. Yes. He's saying that weighted by the 12 proportion of time a worker employed in a job spent in an 13 LO area. Okay, but again, if there's workers just going 14 through that area, they're not considered in that job 15 class. So that's, that's just, you know, my 16 interpretation. 17 Q. Okay. But the impact, the net impact of not 18 classifying workers who move in and out of areas could 19 both increase or decrease exposure estimates, correct? 20 A. It could. 21 Q. Okay. So it's not necessarily a bias that 22 would have a specific impact of increasing or decreasing 23 in one way for certain, correct? 24 A. Yeah, it's a bias I don't know how you would 25 measure unless you had a pump on each person as they</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">151</p> <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Later, in the next sentence -- the next 3 paragraph, actually, he says: 4 "However, the 'guesstimates' for those LOs 5 prior to 1968 had a small effect on the average cumulative 6 exposure estimate for the overall cohort, and on the 7 estimates of the exposure-response curves, because a small 8 number of workers was employed in these areas." 9 Did I read that correctly, sir? 10 A. You read that correctly. 11 Q. Do you believe that's a relevant qualification 12 for the guesstimate issue that he himself has flagged? 13 A. Well, it is in the aspect that when he's 14 looking at number of workers employed under a given job 15 class in these areas, but it does not really factor in 16 employees that have to go through those area, or even in 17 it's intermittently, that do not have that job class. So 18 that would be the only caveat I would add. 19 Q. So that might have the impact of 20 underestimating exposure? 21 A. Well, or just not determining exposure to all 22 workers because they weren't in that job class. There 23 were other workers who went through that area who were 24 exposed. 25 Q. Okay. The next paragraph, there does seem to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">153</p> <p>1 walked through these areas -- 2 Q. Right. 3 A. -- but that wasn't done. 4 Q. But given the data that they had, this was 5 again a reasonable means of trying to compensate for that? 6 A. Sure. 7 Q. Okay. Could we move to page 10, please, the 8 "Discussion"? I'm going to read beginning with the first 9 sentence under there: 10 "The questionable accuracy of the exposure 11 estimates before 1968 is recognized. Key factors that 12 need to be considered in estimating exposure are 13 precision, time periods for combining samples, estimators, 14 the conversion ratio, and assumptions as to exposures in 15 areas where samples have not been taken. In most studies 16 such as ours, there is little one can do but work within 17 the constraints of the available data." 18 Did I read that correctly, sir? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Do you agree with that statement? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. Okay. And again, just so we're clear, the 23 guesstimate, that question applies to exposures that 24 occurred prior, 1968 and earlier, correct? 25 A. Well, in talking about specific exposure</p>

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">154</p> <p>1 results or quantification, yeah.</p> <p>2 Q. Yes.</p> <p>3 A. I mean, obviously, exposure areas where</p> <p>4 samples have not been taken, well, obviously, we don't</p> <p>5 have any exposure data, do we?</p> <p>6 Q. Right. But there was, there was an attempt to</p> <p>7 address that, was there not?</p> <p>8 A. Right.</p> <p>9 Q. And that would be Table VI of the report,</p> <p>10 correct, sir?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. So once again, they are making a reasonable</p> <p>13 effort to compensate for any limitations of the historical</p> <p>14 data, correct?</p> <p>15 A. I think they were doing the best they could do</p> <p>16 with the data they had.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Are there any -- strike that. Do you</p> <p>18 know of any other literature other than -- let me back up</p> <p>19 one second.</p> <p>20 Dr. McDonald also did a study of this population,</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And is it fair to say that his exposure</p> <p>24 analysis has some of the same virtues and limitations that</p> <p>25 we just discussed with respect to Dr. Amandus's study?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">156</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And that was also -- the Sullivan paper</p> <p>3 was a peer-reviewed, published paper, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Now, when going through your report, we</p> <p>6 identified a lot of sections as dealing with Grace's</p> <p>7 conduct, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And in reaching these opinions, you developed</p> <p>10 a certain amount of familiarity with the Libby vermiculite</p> <p>11 mining and milling operation as a whole, correct, sir?</p> <p>12 A. In reaching these opinions?</p> <p>13 Q. In reaching your opinions characterizing --</p> <p>14 well, let me ask it a little bit differently.</p> <p>15 In order to assess Grace's conduct, you first had to</p> <p>16 become very familiar with the Libby vermiculite mining and</p> <p>17 milling operation as a whole, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. I have been, I have been assessing this</p> <p>19 situation since 1996, and my opinions have not changed</p> <p>20 regardless of research that I've done in terms of how I</p> <p>21 think Grace behaved or the hazards of Libby amphibole.</p> <p>22 Q. Right. And I guess the point I'm trying to</p> <p>23 reach, though, in reaching your opinions, you had to learn</p> <p>24 about what actually happened year in and year out at the</p> <p>25 mining operation in Libby, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">155</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Other than Dr. Amandus and</p> <p>3 Dr. McDonald's papers, are you aware of any other</p> <p>4 published literature which more accurately captures the</p> <p>5 exposure experience within the Libby facility?</p> <p>6 A. Involving the mine, no.</p> <p>7 Q. Let me ask that again because you're right, I</p> <p>8 should have clarified. Other than Amandus and McDonald's</p> <p>9 papers, are you aware of any other published report that</p> <p>10 more accurately characterizes the asbestos exposure</p> <p>11 experience in the Libby vermiculite mining and milling</p> <p>12 operation?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Are you aware of any unpublished papers or</p> <p>15 reports that more accurately characterize the asbestos</p> <p>16 exposure conditions in the Libby vermiculite mining and</p> <p>17 milling operation?</p> <p>18 A. I'm not.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the Sullivan</p> <p>20 paper. You mentioned it earlier, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. That was published in 2008? 2007?</p> <p>23 A. Pretty recently, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Fairly recently. The exposure data for that</p> <p>25 paper was Amandus's paper that we just reviewed, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">157</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So it is certainly an area where you</p> <p>3 consider yourself to be very familiar?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And part of the Libby operation</p> <p>6 involved sending ore elsewhere, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And this was unexpanded vermiculite,</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And was there asbestos in that vermiculite?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And that asbestos would go where -- or, excuse</p> <p>14 me, that vermiculite would go where?</p> <p>15 A. Well, the vermiculite would go to expanding</p> <p>16 plants across the country.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Some of those plants were owned by</p> <p>18 Grace, correct?</p> <p>19 A. I believe some of them were.</p> <p>20 Q. And some of them were not, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. For example, O.M. Scott, the fertilizer</p> <p>23 manufacturing facility, expanded vermiculite, did they</p> <p>24 not?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">158</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So that would be an example of an 2 expanding operation that was not owned by Grace, correct? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Okay. And the workers in those plants would 5 have been at risk of being exposed to asbestos, correct? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And in the case of the Marysville, Ohio 8 facility, they were in fact exposed to asbestos, correct? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. And you have no reason to believe that 11 that would be any different in the numerous other 12 expanding plants all across the country, correct? 13 A. That workers were exposed to asbestos? 14 Q. Yes. 15 A. No. 16 Q. Right. It occurred all over the country, did 17 it not? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Okay. Now, are you familiar with the various 20 products that were generated using Libby vermiculite? 21 A. I am somewhat familiar with the products. 22 I've looked through the, you know, the exhibits over time 23 and saw they used it in cement and -- 24 Q. So let's, if we can -- which products are you 25 familiar with?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">160</p> <p>1 Q. And what were the findings of that analysis? 2 A. Well, they're very preliminary. In fact, 3 they're still being worked up but -- so it's, I mean we -- 4 fibers were detected in areas outside of the plant that is 5 no longer there. 6 Q. Okay. So this is just one example; however, 7 in this example, it illustrates that people outside of an 8 expanding plant outside of Libby - in this case, Spokane - 9 may have been exposed to asbestos that was released during 10 the expanding process, correct? 11 A. I suppose that's correct. And then the other 12 work would be - you said outside of Libby - would be 13 associated with the vermiculite grant that we're currently 14 working doing the homes. 15 Q. And this is -- oh, this is what we were 16 speaking about earlier, looking at the attic insulation. 17 A. Right. 18 Q. Right. And so that -- and, okay. Is it fair 19 to say there may be some distinctions there, though? With 20 the attic insulation, you have exposure to 21 already-expanded vermiculite, correct? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. But there's still asbestos in it, right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. So there could be an exposure, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">159</p> <p>1 A. I don't know, Monokote; I don't know, other 2 types of cement products I've seen in the exhibits; the 3 insulation; foundation insulation. 4 Q. Okay. So like, for example, Monokote-3 -- 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. -- that contained vermiculite and chrysotile, 7 correct? 8 A. I believe so. 9 Q. So a person who was exposed to Monokote-3 may 10 have been exposed to asbestos from Libby. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Okay. Similarly, a person who had Zonolite 13 attic insulation in their home, they could have been 14 exposed to asbestos from Libby, correct? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Okay. And to the extent that there were 17 expanding operations in various cities, to the extent that 18 there was -- well, let me rephrase this. 19 Have you studied exposures to asbestos from Libby 20 that occurred outside of Libby? 21 A. We have done some preliminary work in Spokane. 22 Q. What kind of work is this? 23 A. It was, again, through the COBRE grant. And 24 we basically did a very preliminary survey of 25 neighborhoods surrounding the Spokane expanding plant.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">161</p> <p>1 A. We're talking about the attic insulation? 2 Q. Yes. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. An expanding plant, by its very nature, you 5 have unexpanded vermiculite going in, correct? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. So the people there may have been exposed to 8 unexpanded vermiculite, correct? 9 A. As well as after it's expanded. 10 Q. Right. So, but it -- certainly, the exposure 11 one would have to unexpanded vermiculite would be 12 different, potentially, in terms of potential intensity 13 than an exposure to expanded vermiculite, correct? 14 A. I mean it could be. I don't know if I've seen 15 enough data to draw any conclusions on that. 16 Q. Now, within the Libby community, is it fair to 17 say you have people - not workers, putting workers aside - 18 within the Libby community, is it fair to say that you 19 have people who were exposed in Libby to both unexpanded 20 and expanded vermiculite? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. What would be potential expanded vermiculite 23 -- let me rephrase that. 24 What would be an example of expanded vermiculite 25 exposures that would occur in Libby?</p>

41 (Pages 158 to 161)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">162</p> <p>1 A. Of expanded or unexpanded?</p> <p>2 Q. Expanded.</p> <p>3 A. Of expanded, the vermiculite attic insulation.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. I believe some expanded stuff was used in some</p> <p>6 of the gardens or the lawns, and then people were</p> <p>7 expanding it themselves on their stoves to watch it pop.</p> <p>8 Q. That's right. But that would actually be an</p> <p>9 exposure to unexpanded that became expanded, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Expanded, yeah, I don't know.</p> <p>11 Q. But what exposures to unexpanded vermiculite</p> <p>12 occurred within the Libby community?</p> <p>13 A. Well, I think to the processed ore being</p> <p>14 hauled into Libby, for one; as well as material that was</p> <p>15 transported across the river and then brought into the</p> <p>16 town by railroad car, and then leaks occurred and</p> <p>17 contaminated areas around the railroad.</p> <p>18 Q. So these leaks caused expansion -- so these</p> <p>19 leaks around the railroad caused exposure to unexpanded</p> <p>20 vermiculite in Libby, correct?</p> <p>21 A. You asked about unexpanded, right?</p> <p>22 Q. Yes, sir; yes.</p> <p>23 A. I believe that the EPA has found unexpanded</p> <p>24 vermiculite in some of the operable units they're now</p> <p>25 currently trying to clean up.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">164</p> <p>1 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) And this is northeast of</p> <p>2 Libby, correct, sir?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And Location 1 appears to be just north</p> <p>5 of the mine, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Well, Location 1 was actually right up at the</p> <p>7 mine site itself, I think.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So you put that on mine property?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Location 2 appears to be north of the</p> <p>11 mine. Is that, is that a fair statement, sir?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, going down the road a ways.</p> <p>13 Q. How far from the mine would you say Location 2</p> <p>14 is?</p> <p>15 A. Probably a couple miles. I guess as the road</p> <p>16 travels, a couple miles; less by -- less as the crow</p> <p>17 flies.</p> <p>18 Q. And then Location 3 occurred at what appears</p> <p>19 to be the intersection of Highway 37 and Rainey Creek</p> <p>20 Road; is that correct, sir?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Now, Location 1 and 2, can I just walk</p> <p>23 up there right now and sample that if I wanted to myself?</p> <p>24 A. If you got permission from EPA, you could.</p> <p>25 Q. I need permission from EPA, right, because</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">163</p> <p>1 Q. And particularly with respect to the railroad</p> <p>2 exposures, those would also occur or could have occurred</p> <p>3 outside of Libby as well, correct?</p> <p>4 A. I would say so, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Let me rephrase that a little bit more</p> <p>6 artfully. People outside of Libby may have been exposed</p> <p>7 to unexpanded vermiculite through leaks from railcars,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And that would have meant -- that could have</p> <p>11 meant exposure to actual asbestos from those railcars,</p> <p>12 correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Libby asbestos, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. I'd like to go back to your 2006 paper.</p> <p>17 I believe it's Exhibit 3. I'm looking on page 2, and</p> <p>18 there's a picture of a map on page 2. That's Libby,</p> <p>19 correct -- or that's actually an area outside of Libby,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yeah, that's showing the mine road there.</p> <p>22 MR. STANSBURY: All right. And just so the</p> <p>23 record is clear, by page 2, I mean page 461 of the</p> <p>24 published paper, but I think Dr. Spear understood what I</p> <p>25 meant.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">165</p> <p>1 that's a restricted area, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Right.</p> <p>3 Q. People just can't walk into either Location 1</p> <p>4 or 2 that you sampled, right?</p> <p>5 A. That is correct.</p> <p>6 Q. What about Location 3?</p> <p>7 A. Location 3 was just right off the highway, so</p> <p>8 that's open to access.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. So it's fair to say that the average</p> <p>10 person is not wandering around Location 1 or 2 on any</p> <p>11 given day, correct?</p> <p>12 A. I hope not.</p> <p>13 Q. Unless they're wearing a protective suit.</p> <p>14 Okay. Now, you say on page 461, page 2 of the document,</p> <p>15 looking at the left-hand column, second paragraph, last</p> <p>16 sentence, tell me if I read this correctly:</p> <p>17 "Since asbestos fibers are durable silicates</p> <p>18 and do not decompose in the environment, the airborne</p> <p>19 asbestos fibers released and dispersed from the Libby mine</p> <p>20 and processing areas throughout 70 years of operation have</p> <p>21 likely deposited throughout the surrounding areas."</p> <p>22 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And this study looked at the depositing of</p> <p>25 fibers in bark, correct?</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">166</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have any way of knowing whether the</p> <p>3 asbestos in a given bark, bark sample, was released 20</p> <p>4 years ago as opposed to 40 years ago?</p> <p>5 A. Not in samples collected in this area, we</p> <p>6 don't. We've collected samples outside of the mine sites</p> <p>7 in what's called the - I'm trying to think of the name -</p> <p>8 the Forest Service has a testing facility where they have</p> <p>9 larch trees or some type of tree. And all of those trees</p> <p>10 were planted after the mine was shut down, and we've done</p> <p>11 bark sampling in there and we've found fibers.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. But that would be part of that study</p> <p>13 you mentioned earlier, correct, the forestry? That's part</p> <p>14 of your forestry study?</p> <p>15 A. Well, actually, it's been -- it's part of,</p> <p>16 kind of, a method to determine along -- you know, EPA has</p> <p>17 now done a lot of bark sampling in lines going out from</p> <p>18 the mine using our method, and basically -- so we</p> <p>19 basically started the work in trying to find out how far</p> <p>20 from the mine have they gone, so it's part of that work.</p> <p>21 We did do additional bark sampling as part of the Forest</p> <p>22 Service study. You are correct there.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And that, that analysis, though, has</p> <p>24 not been discussed in your expert report. We didn't see</p> <p>25 it when we were looking at your report, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">168</p> <p>1 Q. Right. And --</p> <p>2 A. So then after we realized those were all</p> <p>3 negative and it doesn't seem very plausible they'd be</p> <p>4 taken up in the root system, we discontinued that</p> <p>5 approach.</p> <p>6 Q. What about the soil samples? Did you publish</p> <p>7 the soil sample results?</p> <p>8 A. They were not published as part of this paper</p> <p>9 and I don't even know what the results are.</p> <p>10 Q. So you don't know whether there was asbestos</p> <p>11 in the actual soil there?</p> <p>12 A. Yeah, I can't recall what happened to the soil</p> <p>13 samples.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the term</p> <p>15 "naturally occurring asbestos"?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, I think that's -- I've been told in some</p> <p>18 ways that's kind a misnomer, in that all asbestos is</p> <p>19 naturally occurring.</p> <p>20 A. Right.</p> <p>21 Q. But what I'm speaking of particularly is</p> <p>22 asbestos, and particularly the Libby amphibole, that was</p> <p>23 not released as part of Grace's vermiculite operation.</p> <p>24 Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">167</p> <p>1 A. That's correct.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. But for this paper, you were not able</p> <p>3 to tell when the asbestos was actually released, correct?</p> <p>4 A. That would be correct.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Moving to page 462, page 3 of the</p> <p>6 document, looking at the table, and I see results here for</p> <p>7 tests that were done on various locations. I see three</p> <p>8 samples for Location 1; is that correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yeah, so Location 1, three samples.</p> <p>10 Q. And are those all bark samples?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, they would all be bark samples.</p> <p>12 Q. One question I had, if we could move, the same</p> <p>13 page but on the right column, I guess five lines down from</p> <p>14 the top: "Tree core samples were only collected from the</p> <p>15 locations surrounding the mine in the initial sampling</p> <p>16 program."</p> <p>17 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. What are the tree core samples?</p> <p>20 A. When we began doing the bark sampling, we</p> <p>21 wanted to make sure we covered all bases, so we did take</p> <p>22 soil samples near the tree, we also took bark samples, and</p> <p>23 then we did tree core samples to make sure that the fibers</p> <p>24 were not being taken up by the root system and would be</p> <p>25 inside the tree, basically.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">169</p> <p>1 Q. Do you have an opinion about, and we're going</p> <p>2 to just use the term "naturally occurring asbestos"?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. What is your opinion?</p> <p>5 A. My opinion is that in over thousands of years</p> <p>6 with deposits up there on the hill and natural erosion,</p> <p>7 that there could be some naturally occurring asbestos, but</p> <p>8 I think that the releases from that compared to releases</p> <p>9 from activities associated with the mine would be, would</p> <p>10 be much less.</p> <p>11 Q. Where would the naturally occurring asbestos</p> <p>12 be located?</p> <p>13 A. What do you mean "be located"?</p> <p>14 Q. Well, I mean, for example, if I'm in the</p> <p>15 center of Libby, you know, let's say St. John's Hospital,</p> <p>16 is there naturally occurring asbestos in the soil right</p> <p>17 there?</p> <p>18 A. Well, I don't know that.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion as to where</p> <p>20 naturally occurring asbestos would most likely be found in</p> <p>21 the Lincoln County area?</p> <p>22 A. I guess I don't.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 A. I mean in terms -- are you referring to</p> <p>25 asbestos that moved somewhere else, or what's in the</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">170</p> <p>1 actual mineral deposits that existed?</p> <p>2 Q. Mineral deposits the existed.</p> <p>3 A. Yeah, I think it could be -- I think it's been</p> <p>4 found in some of the river areas, if I remember right, and</p> <p>5 I don't spend a lot of time reading the mineralogy</p> <p>6 journals, but -- (pause.)</p> <p>7 Q. Right. Are you aware if there are any</p> <p>8 mineralogical differences between the Libby amphiboles</p> <p>9 that were released from the vermiculite mining operation</p> <p>10 as opposed to those Libby amphiboles that have occurred</p> <p>11 naturally?</p> <p>12 A. You're referring to the Gunter papers,</p> <p>13 probably?</p> <p>14 Q. Yes.</p> <p>15 A. I believe he's contending that just recently,</p> <p>16 yes, that if it doesn't have the sodium/potassium peak,</p> <p>17 then it's not from the mine. So I'm aware of some of that</p> <p>18 work, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you in any way when conducting this -- let</p> <p>20 me start over.</p> <p>21 Have you analyzed any of your samples using</p> <p>22 Dr. Gunter's analysis to determine whether the asbestos</p> <p>23 that you detected was from the mining and milling</p> <p>24 operation as opposed to naturally occurring asbestos?</p> <p>25 A. Well, we haven't -- for one thing, I'm not,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">172</p> <p>1 whether or not they were from the mining and milling</p> <p>2 operation as opposed to just naturally occurring asbestos,</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A. We could do that. I mean we have the peaks,</p> <p>5 like I'm trying to tell you.</p> <p>6 Q. But you haven't reported that, correct?</p> <p>7 A. No, we have not reported that.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Nor have you, sitting here today,</p> <p>9 analyzed these data for those purposes?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Looking back at Table 1, it looks, if</p> <p>12 I'm not mistaken, and correct me if I'm wrong, that there</p> <p>13 were quite a few amphibole fibers in the tree bark from</p> <p>14 sample 1A on Location 1, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And 530 million amphibole fibers per gram of</p> <p>17 bark. Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>18 A. So which sample are we looking at again?</p> <p>19 Q. I'm looking at the first sample, Location 1,</p> <p>20 amphibole fiber per gram of bark.</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. So that translates to 100 million fibers per</p> <p>23 cc, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And would that number include fibers less than</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">171</p> <p>1 I'm not -- I think there's a lot of variability in what we</p> <p>2 would find in given deposits. In other words, when Meeker</p> <p>3 did his work, he looked at, you know, a larger number of</p> <p>4 samples than previous researches, and now Gunter has</p> <p>5 looked at many more samples. So I think that, you know,</p> <p>6 there's going to be variability in what we see based on</p> <p>7 the number of samples, and I think that Gunter is drawing</p> <p>8 some conclusions that I'm not saying I'm going to agree</p> <p>9 with.</p> <p>10 But in terms of your question, you know, we sent all</p> <p>11 our samples in for transmission electron microscopy so we</p> <p>12 get the peaks with the results. And I can only tell you</p> <p>13 the only ones I've looked at would be the recent ones that</p> <p>14 we've done, because I haven't had time to go back and look</p> <p>15 at the other ones, but I think I will. And we found the</p> <p>16 sodium/potassium peaks in 60 percent of the last batch of</p> <p>17 samples we've taken from the forest.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And those peaks would suggest that they</p> <p>19 were actually from the milling operation?</p> <p>20 A. From the mine.</p> <p>21 Q. Mine.</p> <p>22 A. What Gunter is calling "the mine."</p> <p>23 Q. Right, the mine. This 2006 paper, though, the</p> <p>24 samples that were reported in this paper, you've in no way</p> <p>25 analyzed them in a method that would enable you to say</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">173</p> <p>1 5 microns?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So in this table, you haven't</p> <p>4 differentiated between fibers that are shorter than</p> <p>5 5 microns and those that are longer, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yeah. The process that we use is called AHERA</p> <p>7 TEM, basically. And so we ask the lab to report results</p> <p>8 back for all fibers greater than 0.1 micrometers in</p> <p>9 length. So we get it broken down by -- we got it broken</p> <p>10 down by less than 5, greater than 5.</p> <p>11 Q. Would that include cleavage fragments as well?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. But it would include fibers less than</p> <p>14 5 microns in length.</p> <p>15 A. Correct.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So it would, this would be a</p> <p>17 distinct -- well, let me rephrase that.</p> <p>18 In order to compare these data to, let's say,</p> <p>19 Amandus's data, you would need to exclude fibers less than</p> <p>20 5 microns in order to do an apples-to-apples comparison,</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 A. Well, yeah, these are bark samples. I mean we</p> <p>23 aren't talking about air samples.</p> <p>24 Q. These are just bark samples.</p> <p>25 A. These are bulk samples.</p>

44 (Pages 170 to 173)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">174</p> <p>1 Q. Right. So these -- so that's a fair point. 2 So these are not directly correlated to airborne 3 exposures, right? 4 A. No. These are, these are media samples. 5 These are samples in a given media like bark. 6 Q. Okay. 7 A. I would certainly make no attempt to compare 8 it to, you know, airborne. 9 Q. Would you be willing to offer an opinion as to 10 what the potential airborne exposures would be from these 11 trees given those measurements, those bulk measurements? 12 A. Well, just looking at the amount in bark, no, 13 because again, that's why we've tried to conduct other 14 studies. We're trying to find out: Well, if it's in the 15 media, then how does it get out of the media? 16 Q. Right. And that's what your 2007 study 17 relates to, correct? 18 A. Right. 19 Q. So this study, this would not support an 20 opinion that there are actual exposures occurring because 21 of the asbestos that had been trapped in the barks of 22 trees. This study merely identifies the presence of 23 asbestos fibers in the barks of trees, correct? 24 A. It supports the scientific hypothesis that 25 asbestos fibers traveled through the air and deposited on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">176</p> <p>1 Q. And that translates to 5.8 million fibers per 2 cubic -- per square centimeter, correct? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Now, one thing I noticed was the analytical 5 sensitivity for Location 5 as opposed to Location 4. And 6 analytical sensitivity, is that the lowest level that you 7 would be able to detect? How would you describe 8 "analytical sensitivity"? 9 A. It's the lowest detect limits for a fiber that 10 a lab can do and get repeatable results. So depending on 11 what method you're collecting samples by, whether you're 12 doing like PCM analysis where they just count fibers, that 13 has a different analytical sensitivity than when they're 14 doing TEM on an air sample. And then when they're doing 15 bulk sample, so these are essentially bulk analysis, 16 there's going to be a different analytical sensitivity 17 associated with that. 18 Q. And so if I understand that correctly, 19 19 million was the analytical sensitivity for the sample from 20 Albany, New York, correct? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. And the one, the analytical sensitivity for 23 Location 5 which was in Libby by the rail station was 1.2 24 million, correct? 25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">175</p> <p>1 these trees. 2 Q. Okay. But as we stated earlier, you didn't 3 differentiate between fibers that were naturally occurring 4 as opposed to those that were released from the Grace 5 mining/milling operation, correct? 6 A. Well, in this particular paper. I told you we 7 have looked at bark samples from the same area and they 8 contained the sodium/potassium peaks. 9 Q. But you haven't reported or produced those 10 findings? 11 A. No, we haven't. 12 Q. Okay. And you certainly haven't produced them 13 in this case, correct? 14 A. That's correct. 15 Q. Okay. Looking back at the table, Location 4 16 is your control, correct? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. And that is Albany, New York, and it's a pine 19 tree. And you detected no amphibole fibers, correct? 20 A. Correct. 21 Q. Location 5 is on the rail line, correct? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. And you detected 19 million amphibole fibers 24 per gram of bark, correct? 25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">177</p> <p>1 Q. So if there had been 10 million amphibole 2 fibers per gram of bark in the Albany, New York pine, you 3 would not have been able to detect that, correct? 4 A. Well, yeah. It's really based on their 5 ability to be able to count. Usually, TEM analysis in 6 terms of at least an air sample, they want the ability to 7 be able to see 1 fiber per square millimeter of filter 8 that they analyze. Okay? So it's really, I think, 9 related more to the type of material, the bulk of material 10 that they analyze. 11 Q. More related to the type. So why was the 12 analytical sensitivity so much lower for Location 5 as 13 opposed to the control group? 14 A. It could be because there's different types of 15 bark, different types of tree. This is a big variable in 16 all this work -- 17 Q. Right. 18 A. -- is different trees have different bark. So 19 that would be the best I can explain it. I mean Jim 20 Webber would be the best person to explain that. He's the 21 analyst. 22 Q. But, I mean, just so I -- kind of going back 23 to one of my previous questions: If there had been 10 24 million amphibole fibers per gram of bark in Location 4's 25 sample, it still would have not been detected given that</p>

45 (Pages 174 to 177)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">178</p> <p>1 analytical sensitivity, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Well, I don't know if that's entirely</p> <p>3 accurate, because like I say, they do the method so that</p> <p>4 they can detect a certain number of fibers per area of</p> <p>5 what they're analyzing. So I don't know. I see what</p> <p>6 you're going -- I see where you're going with your</p> <p>7 question, but -- (pause.)</p> <p>8 Q. Right. But it's something that --</p> <p>9 A. I don't know if that's right or wrong.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay; okay, that's fair. But Location 7 was</p> <p>11 the Libby Middle School track and there were 0.13 million</p> <p>12 amphibole fibers per gram of bark and 0.25 million</p> <p>13 amphibole fibers per square centimeter, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And again, the detection analytical</p> <p>16 sensitivity for Location 7 was 0.13 million, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yeah.</p> <p>18 Q. And the amount detected was right at that</p> <p>19 analytical sensitivity level, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Pretty close.</p> <p>21 Q. Needless to say, if the same analytical</p> <p>22 sensitivity used for Location 4 were used on Location 7,</p> <p>23 none would have been detected, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Well, if that analytical sensitivity applied</p> <p>25 to that sample, yeah, but I don't think it does.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">180</p> <p>1 speak to that either way?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And Then Location 8 was Asa Wood</p> <p>4 Elementary School. I take it that is in Libby; is that</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And there were no fibers detected there,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Right.</p> <p>10 Q. So we see a great range of asbestos in the</p> <p>11 trees, with one end of the spectrum being Location 1,</p> <p>12 which is, as you said, on the mine site; with Asa Wood</p> <p>13 Elementary in town, where no fibers were detected in the</p> <p>14 bark, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Exactly. We were trying to do that very</p> <p>16 thing. We wanted to start at the mine and then go out.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Of course, as I said earlier, Locations</p> <p>18 1 and 2 where you had the highest exposures, people just</p> <p>19 can't walk onto those areas without first getting</p> <p>20 clearance in EPA, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Right.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. In doing your analysis, did you ever</p> <p>23 try to identify whether there was any vermiculite deposits</p> <p>24 within the bark?</p> <p>25 A. I guess I don't understand that question.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">179</p> <p>1 Q. Why is that?</p> <p>2 A. Well, because I've tried to explain what I</p> <p>3 know about it, is the fact that it's going to depend upon</p> <p>4 the sample preparation, the type of bark, the amount of</p> <p>5 bark that they use. I mean, for example, if I collected</p> <p>6 air samples and I send in five different air samples to a</p> <p>7 lab for TEM analysis, the analytical sensitivity for every</p> <p>8 one of those samples is going to be different because of</p> <p>9 the volume of air that we collect.</p> <p>10 Q. Right. So the -- I understand why you have</p> <p>11 different sensitivities; however, the sensitivity is still</p> <p>12 a, if you will, a cutoff point below which you cannot</p> <p>13 reliably report the data, correct?</p> <p>14 A. In that sample, yeah.</p> <p>15 Q. Right. And so to the extent that there -- if</p> <p>16 there had been, for whatever reason, a 19 million fibers</p> <p>17 per gram analytical sensitivity for Location 7, it</p> <p>18 certainly would not have been able to detect the 0.13</p> <p>19 million amphibole per gram of bark that you reported,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A. Well, yeah, again, if that sensitivity applied</p> <p>22 to those different samples. I mean I would have to say</p> <p>23 what I'd say before. I don't know if that's accurate or</p> <p>24 not.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. So sitting here today, you really can't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">181</p> <p>1 Q. Well, is -- vermiculite dust, can that be</p> <p>2 transferred through the air?</p> <p>3 A. Oh, sure, I'm sure it could.</p> <p>4 Q. And vermiculite dust could have ended up on</p> <p>5 the bark of tree as well, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Sure.</p> <p>7 Q. And if there was a high level of vermiculite</p> <p>8 dust in the tree, that would, perhaps, suggest that the</p> <p>9 dust had come from the mining and milling facility as</p> <p>10 opposed to naturally occurring asbestos, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Because vermiculite can't be naturally</p> <p>12 occurring? I'm not following your logic.</p> <p>13 Q. Well, I mean, vermiculite -- it occurs in</p> <p>14 Vermiculite Mountain, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yeah.</p> <p>16 Q. And that's the primary source of vermiculite</p> <p>17 in the area, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah.</p> <p>19 Q. So to the extent that there was vermiculite in</p> <p>20 tree bark, what other sources of vermiculite would you</p> <p>21 attribute that to other than from Vermiculite Mountain?</p> <p>22 A. Well, I wouldn't attribute it to any.</p> <p>23 Q. Right. And so would that have been a way of</p> <p>24 determining whether some of this asbestos was actually</p> <p>25 coming from Vermiculite Mountain, whether there was</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">182</p> <p>1 actually vermiculite dust located there as well?</p> <p>2 A. I guess it could have been.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. I mean we were studying asbestos, but --</p> <p>5 (pause.)</p> <p>6 Q. Right. So there's no, in any of these studies</p> <p>7 -- no time in any of these did you actually identify</p> <p>8 whether vermiculite itself was present, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Well, not to my knowledge. I haven't seen all</p> <p>10 of the scans from all of these different samples, either,</p> <p>11 so --</p> <p>12 Q. But it certainly hasn't been reported in the</p> <p>13 papers?</p> <p>14 A. It hasn't been reported in the papers.</p> <p>15 Q. Right. And you certainly haven't produced</p> <p>16 that in this case.</p> <p>17 A. (Nodding head affirmatively.)</p> <p>18 Q. Now, on page 464, the last paragraph before</p> <p>19 "Discussion":</p> <p>20 "SEM observation revealed that the amphibole</p> <p>21 fibers were deposited on the surface of the bark and not</p> <p>22 through its depth. Most of the fibers were located in the</p> <p>23 crevices and wrinkles of the bark rather than on its</p> <p>24 smooth surfaces."</p> <p>25 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">184</p> <p>1 for - classification. I mean I can go out and look at a</p> <p>2 tree and I don't know what kind of tree it is. So that's</p> <p>3 about all I can say about that. I mean that's -- the</p> <p>4 question that we always get is, you know: How does bark</p> <p>5 relate to all of this?</p> <p>6 Q. Right.</p> <p>7 A. Or tree species.</p> <p>8 Q. Right. And so sitting here today, you have no</p> <p>9 opinion as to how that would impact your data?</p> <p>10 A. Well, tree species, we only sample at a</p> <p>11 certain distance where we can reach a tree. I mean if you</p> <p>12 go -- what happens if you go up into a tree? Are there</p> <p>13 fibers loosely held on the pine needles? You know, this</p> <p>14 is just very exploratory.</p> <p>15 Q. Right. And at this point, you know, there</p> <p>16 were, there were eight samples, one of which was a</p> <p>17 control, so -- actually, I don't see a Sample 6, so I</p> <p>18 guess there were seven samples, one of which was a</p> <p>19 control; so six actual samples, two of which were in the</p> <p>20 restricted area, and one of which was also right at the</p> <p>21 intersection the Rainey Creek Road and Highway 37,</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you believe that those samples and the</p> <p>25 findings in those samples are representative of the forest</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">183</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Could you explain in lay terms what that</p> <p>3 means?</p> <p>4 A. Well, it just means if you look -- I think the</p> <p>5 easiest way is just to look at the pictures. It refers</p> <p>6 you to these pictures.</p> <p>7 Q. I like pictures.</p> <p>8 A. Well, I mean, you know, so the purpose of the</p> <p>9 pictures is that you look at Figure 2 and you can see</p> <p>10 certain long fibers. And then you look at exactly the</p> <p>11 same spot on the micrograph that was blown up to larger</p> <p>12 magnification, and you start to see many more fibers that</p> <p>13 are embedded deeper into the bark. So you look at the</p> <p>14 bark surface under a microscope. As you could imagine,</p> <p>15 it's going to be rough and a lot of little crevices and</p> <p>16 stuff. So basically, it just -- it works its way into the</p> <p>17 crevices and stays there.</p> <p>18 Q. Now, do trees shed their bark over time?</p> <p>19 A. Some do.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know whether these particular trees do?</p> <p>21 A. I think some of these species do. I'm not a</p> <p>22 botanist so I'm not going there.</p> <p>23 Q. Who is the botanist on this?</p> <p>24 A. Well, we had, early on we had a student who</p> <p>25 was doing some of the bark - what's the word I'm looking</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">185</p> <p>1 in Lincoln County in general?</p> <p>2 A. Well, you don't have to rely on my -- or our</p> <p>3 paper for this particular question because all you have to</p> <p>4 do is go to the EPA Web site. And just like those other</p> <p>5 EPA papers I'm referring to, you can get them off the Web</p> <p>6 site; that you asked them if I cite them or not, well,</p> <p>7 they're on the web site. But anyway, you can go to EPA's</p> <p>8 Web site and you can see a map of what they found in the</p> <p>9 bark going from the mine all the way across Lake Koocanusa</p> <p>10 and they will give you concentration gradients going</p> <p>11 beyond the mine.</p> <p>12 Q. Right.</p> <p>13 A. So you can draw your own conclusions from</p> <p>14 that.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. But your conclusions, based on your</p> <p>16 analysis, you would not purport to have taken a</p> <p>17 representative sample in this paper, correct?</p> <p>18 A. In this paper, we were starting at the mine.</p> <p>19 We wanted to -- we assumed that would have the highest</p> <p>20 level of contaminants. And then we worked our way away</p> <p>21 from the mine. That was the point.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. It was not to say -- to speak or give</p> <p>23 conclusions about the forest as a whole, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Well, that's not entirely correct, no, because</p> <p>25 obviously, if you would -- if we find it, you know, we</p>

47 (Pages 182 to 185)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">186</p> <p>1 even find half the concentration at the road so many miles 2 down from the mine, then we could assume that the forest 3 in the same circle around that same area could be 4 similarly contaminated. 5 Q. Did you make any effort to randomly select or 6 select a representative sample of the trees that were in 7 the area off of the mine? 8 A. Well, we tried to -- we basically tried to 9 sample in areas which we could easily access, since we 10 were all suited up and it's very difficult work. 11 Q. Sure. 12 A. And so, you know, that would be a good 13 question. And basically, we tried to collect samples from 14 areas moving down from the mine off roadways as far as we 15 could get, and we did try to, over time, have tried to 16 collect samples from representative tree species. 17 How come you and I are the only ones interested in 18 this paper? 19 Q. I think, I think it's fascinating. So, just 20 so I understand what you're saying: You start at the 21 mine, you move farther away all the way in town. However, 22 would you feel comfortable extrapolating these findings to 23 trees that were 5 to 10 miles due south of the mine? 24 A. Well, I mean we didn't have the resources or 25 the manpower to do that sort of approach, so EPA took our</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">188</p> <p>1 correctly: 2 "The result of the railroad sample raises the 3 possibility that the transportation corridors through 4 which Libby vermiculite was hauled to other locations 5 throughout the United States may also be contaminated. 6 This suggests that similar studies of bark from trees near 7 vermiculite processing sites across the country could be 8 used to determine the extent of amphibole fiber 9 contamination in those locales." 10 Did I read that correctly, sir? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And if I understand this correctly, you're 13 saying that because this Libby vermiculite was taken 14 across the country, it is possible that we would find 15 exposures had occurred that resulted in asbestos fibers 16 being deposited in trees far, far away from the Libby 17 mine, correct? 18 A. Is what it's really saying is that, you know, 19 since we've done this work, this approach has been done in 20 other areas of the country. Back in New York, they've 21 used the same approach near chrysotile mines and used to 22 identify, you know, the dispersal of asbestos. So that's 23 what really this is saying, is that this can be used as an 24 approach to track where asbestos goes. 25 Q. Right.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">187</p> <p>1 -- basically what we found after we reported this to EPA, 2 then they did their sampling. They dropped people in by 3 helicopter and took samples on these lines going from the 4 mine. 5 Q. Okay. 6 A. In all directions. 7 Q. So EPA's work, you believe, constitutes a more 8 representative analysis or -- let me rephrase that. 9 The sampling done by EPA, in your opinion, was more 10 comprehensive in its attempt to sample a more 11 representative sample of the trees? 12 A. Representative area around the mine, yes. 13 Q. Right, okay. And I guess, you know, I don't 14 -- you're not purporting to do so here. I'm just trying 15 to make the record clear on this. This is not a paper 16 that is trying to take a number of samples and then 17 extrapolate those findings to the forest in general. 18 That's not what this paper seeks to do, correct? 19 A. I don't believe we have enough samples to do 20 that. 21 Q. Okay. That is just what I was trying to make 22 clear. Moving on to page -- well, staying on page 464, 23 I'll move back to the figures, in the "Conclusion," and 24 this is, I guess, the last two sentences on this page, I'm 25 going to read this, and let me know if I read this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">189</p> <p>1 A. I think that's all it's saying. 2 Q. Well, I guess the language I focused on, 3 though, was: "That the transportation corridors through 4 which Libby vermiculite was hauled to other locations 5 throughout the United States may also be contaminated." 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And you agree with that statement? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Okay. So it is quite possible that there are 10 forests outside of Lincoln County in which unexpanded 11 vermiculite was taken through that area and people who 12 engage in certain activities in that forest may be exposed 13 to asbestos, correct? 14 A. Well, I don't like your use of the word 15 "forest." I mean we're talking about areas adjacent to 16 like a railroad track. 17 Q. Okay. But trees near a railroad track, 18 correct? 19 A. And I'll buy that one. 20 Q. Okay. So let me start that over, then. Is 21 your opinion, then, that because unexpanded vermiculite 22 was sent all across the country, that it is quite possible 23 that there were releases of asbestos that were retained by 24 trees? Correct? 25 A. Yes.</p>

48 (Pages 186 to 189)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">190</p> <p>1 Q. And a person who engages in certain activities 2 around those trees may be exposed to asbestos from this 3 tree, correct?</p> <p>4 A. If they performed some activity that disturbed 5 the media, sure.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And this would be asbestos that came 7 from unexpanded vermiculite, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, or, I guess, asbestos that came from 9 anywhere if it was transported through that area.</p> <p>10 Q. Right, right. Which unexpanded vermiculite 11 was, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. The same kind of unexpanded vermiculite 14 that was found around Libby, correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. If we could move to Exhibit 4 again, 17 which was your harvesting simulations. Now, earlier you 18 corrected me when I made an ill-advised attempt to compare 19 bulk sampling to air samples, that those are not proper 20 data to compare, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. However, here we are now dealing with air 23 samples, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And these are the kind of data that could be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">192</p> <p>1 A. You may be able to, I guess, as long as we're 2 talking about that particular activity.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. In this case, do you intend to offer 4 any opinions about individuals who have worked in some 5 type of logging capacity in the Lincoln County area with 6 respect to what their exposures may have been?</p> <p>7 A. Well, to me, the fact that all of this work 8 started because that's what we were originally proposing 9 was to study logging operations in Libby as a large scale 10 operation, and so we wanted to collect preliminary data, 11 so I guess from that standpoint, we were trying to 12 determine if there was a source of exposure from sawing up 13 wood, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. So the idea of determining whether 15 there's a source of exposure, is it fair to characterize 16 that as a preliminary undertaking?</p> <p>17 A. I think -- well, this says "preliminary" in 18 the title. I don't know if you read that or not.</p> <p>19 Q. Yes, yes. That's a good point. That's -- 20 okay. So at this stage, you are establishing the 21 existence of potential exposures, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. But you haven't reached a point of actually 24 trying to estimate a cumulative exposure that an 25 individual has had who may have engaged in these</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">191</p> <p>1 compared to exposures that occur on a job site, correct?</p> <p>2 A. On a job site where they were sawing up 3 contaminated firewood?</p> <p>4 Q. Well, I mean even more generally. The 5 measurements you take of the activity simulated here, 6 those data measurements, those fiber-per-cc measurements, 7 those data could be compared to other types of 8 occupational exposures to asbestos when trying to assess 9 exposure level, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Well, just in, yeah, saying we've got this 11 level doing this activity and this level taking a chain 12 saw to a piece of wood; yeah, we can do that.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay.</p> <p>14 A. I don't know what it means. This was designed 15 to look at what happens if we start handling these trees.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. But just so I understand, when we were 17 talking about Amandus earlier, we talked about how 18 exposure data was used as part of an epidemiological 19 study, correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And so presumably, to the extent that you have 22 this exposure data, were you to have information about the 23 duration or circumstances surrounding exposure, you could 24 develop a cumulative exposure for somebody if given the 25 right exposure history, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">193</p> <p>1 activities, correct?</p> <p>2 A. I have not.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Nor do you intend to offer an opinion 4 of that nature at the confirmation hearing, correct?</p> <p>5 A. That would be fair.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Now, did you take soil measurements 7 during the course of the sampling activities?</p> <p>8 A. For this paper, I don't believe so.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And some of the activities included 10 literally sawing trees over, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Let me get a quick list of the activities just 13 so, you know, we're not -- I'm not speculating. Where's 14 -- I believe it's in the paper, but off the top of your 15 head, if not, what are the --</p> <p>16 A. Yeah, we basically had -- we tried to divide 17 up into people with different tasks. So we had a 18 chain-sawer; we had a person who would assist the 19 chain-sawer in getting the tree in position, clearing 20 brush; then we would have people that would move the sawed 21 material and stack it --</p> <p>22 Q. Which task --</p> <p>23 A. -- there were two of them.</p> <p>24 Q. Which task did you perform?</p> <p>25 A. I was the chain-sawer.</p>

49 (Pages 190 to 193)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">194</p> <p>1 Q. That's got to be the best job of the bunch.</p> <p>2 A. It was.</p> <p>3 Q. I think the mover got the short end of the</p> <p>4 stick. No pun intended.</p> <p>5 A. Well, I think the stackers. They were -- they</p> <p>6 had to rope --</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: Have you ever been, ever been on a</p> <p>8 chain saw?</p> <p>9 MR. STANSBURY: I have been on a chain saw.</p> <p>10 MR. LEWIS: If you get on one of these big</p> <p>11 chain saws, that's no bargain.</p> <p>12 MR. STANSBURY: Oh, it's -- at least it's</p> <p>13 enjoyable. I've also -- I've been on a chain saw and I've</p> <p>14 shlepped wood around. And between the two, I'll take the</p> <p>15 chain saw.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: But the stackers had to walk,</p> <p>17 you know. So they'd be walking and there'd be hills. I</p> <p>18 think they had the worst job.</p> <p>19 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Okay. And then once the</p> <p>20 tree had fallen, you would also saw the branches off the</p> <p>21 tree, correct?</p> <p>22 A. Right.</p> <p>23 Q. And so as you say, people are walking back and</p> <p>24 forth throughout this process, correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">196</p> <p>1 fibers that were from the Libby mining vermiculite</p> <p>2 operation as opposed to "naturally occurring asbestos,"</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A. We just looked for Libby amphiboles.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. So the amphiboles that were identified</p> <p>6 could have been from the bark of the tree, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Could have been from the soil, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Could have been.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And could have just been naturally</p> <p>11 occurring asbestos, correct?</p> <p>12 A. But all asbestos is naturally occurring.</p> <p>13 Q. Well, let me rephrase that, then: Naturally</p> <p>14 occurring asbestos that was not originally released as</p> <p>15 part of the Grace mining and milling operation, correct?</p> <p>16 A. If it was there, it could have been that,</p> <p>17 sure.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Right, just making clear that you did</p> <p>19 not attempt to differentiate, did you?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 MR. STANSBURY: I think we have 5 minutes left</p> <p>23 on the tape, so why don't we take a quick break and then</p> <p>24 we'll resume after that so he can change the tape.</p> <p>25 VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes Tape 3 of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">195</p> <p>1 Q. Trees are falling from an upright position</p> <p>2 onto the ground, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Kicking up whatever debris is on the ground,</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And so, however -- and you're taking</p> <p>8 measurements of personal breathing zones, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. You're also doing wipe measurements, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. However, with the personal breathing</p> <p>13 zone measurements, you did not differentiate between</p> <p>14 exposures that may have occurred from asbestos coming out</p> <p>15 of the bark of the tree as opposed to asbestos coming out</p> <p>16 of the soil, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Out of the soil or people walking through</p> <p>18 brush that wasn't associated. You know, you're walking</p> <p>19 through brush, I mean like green - what's the word I'm</p> <p>20 looking for - you know, green foliage.</p> <p>21 Q. Right.</p> <p>22 A. Yeah, we didn't account for that and we can't</p> <p>23 account for that.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay, okay. And similarly as we discussed</p> <p>25 earlier, you haven't differentiated between asbestos</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">197</p> <p>1 videotaped deposition of Dr. Terry Spear.</p> <p>2 The time is 1:07. We're off the record.</p> <p>3 (A brief recess was taken.)</p> <p>4 VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:17. This is Tape</p> <p>5 4 of the videotaped deposition of Dr. Terry Spear.</p> <p>6 We're on the record.</p> <p>7 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Going back to Exhibit 4, I believe, if</p> <p>9 we could turn to page 719.</p> <p>10 MR. LEWIS: Seven -- excuse me?</p> <p>11 MR. STANSBURY: Seven nineteen.</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: Thank you.</p> <p>13 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) And Figure 1, location of</p> <p>14 the 2006 harvest, firewood harvesting simulations</p> <p>15 conducted off of Rainey Creek Road, near the former</p> <p>16 vermiculite in the EPA-restricted zone near Libby Montana,</p> <p>17 the distance from Highway 37 to the harvest locations was</p> <p>18 1.5 kilometers.</p> <p>19 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. So that, the harvest location, that's where</p> <p>22 these samples were taken?</p> <p>23 A. The harvest, yeah -- during this study, you</p> <p>24 mean?</p> <p>25 Q. Yes, sir.</p>

50 (Pages 194 to 197)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">198</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. How many trees did you chop down in</p> <p>3 total?</p> <p>4 A. I'm not sure how many trees we chopped down in</p> <p>5 total. I mean we did -- I believe some of the trees were</p> <p>6 partially down, some we felled. They're all standing</p> <p>7 dead. We didn't cut any live trees.</p> <p>8 Q. You didn't cut any live trees at all?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. If we could turn to Table 2 on page</p> <p>11 721, this is TEM wipe sample results from three firewood</p> <p>12 harvest simulation trials conducted in the Libby</p> <p>13 EPA-restricted zone near Libby, Montana.</p> <p>14 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So it sounds like there were three</p> <p>17 harvest trials. Is that what we were talking about</p> <p>18 earlier, where you chop down the trees, cut them up, and</p> <p>19 then haul and stack the wood?</p> <p>20 A. Well, a trial was basically over a given</p> <p>21 period of time. See, we had to limit our time doing this</p> <p>22 work because of the fact that, again, we were suited up</p> <p>23 and it was summertime and we couldn't spend too much time</p> <p>24 in these suits. So a trial would involve like a period of</p> <p>25 time, 40 minutes - an hour, probably 40 minutes, and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">200</p> <p>1 predict airborne releases given bulk measurements of</p> <p>2 asbestos within bark?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. You mentioned in this paper the</p> <p>5 restrictive zone was once used for logging. Is that</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 A. That was my understanding, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. What was the basis of that understanding?</p> <p>9 A. Oh, I think I've -- that's a matter of public</p> <p>10 record. I believe the Forest Service may have told us</p> <p>11 that. I think I've seen it in depositions. Yeah, I don't</p> <p>12 have any doubts about that they were -- that there was</p> <p>13 logging done off that road or nearby. Jackson Creek Road</p> <p>14 comes in from the northeast side of that, or mainly the --</p> <p>15 I don't know if that's important or not, but -- (pause.)</p> <p>16 Q. Well, let's look at Table 1 for a moment.</p> <p>17 A. Okay.</p> <p>18 Q. Now, this is the --</p> <p>19 A. Table 1?</p> <p>20 Q. Yes, on page 720.</p> <p>21 A. Okay.</p> <p>22 Q. Now, this is the PBZ, the personal breathing</p> <p>23 zone results, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And the chain saw operator, which we've</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">199</p> <p>1 whatever trees we cut up during that time period would be</p> <p>2 part of that trial. So we did that three different times.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And as this indicates by the title of</p> <p>4 this table, this harvesting occurred inside the</p> <p>5 EPA-restricted zone, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And I believe on page 722 under</p> <p>8 "Conclusion," the last paragraph of the left column, tell</p> <p>9 me if I read this correctly:</p> <p>10 "The authors recognize that the</p> <p>11 firewood-harvesting simulations presented in this study</p> <p>12 represent near worst-case scenarios."</p> <p>13 Did I read that correctly, sir?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say you would not</p> <p>16 extrapolate any airborne release findings from this study</p> <p>17 to similar activities that would occur elsewhere in and</p> <p>18 around Lincoln County, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Correct, unless we knew the bark levels were</p> <p>20 the same. But we don't know that, so you are correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Did you develop a method for predicting</p> <p>22 the airborne release that would occur from a given bark</p> <p>23 level?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Sitting here today, are you able to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">201</p> <p>1 established was you, correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And "n = 3," that means -- what does that</p> <p>4 equal?</p> <p>5 A. Number of samples we collected.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay, so number of airborne samples. How long</p> <p>7 would you take each sample?</p> <p>8 A. I think it's stated in here somewhere. Again,</p> <p>9 it seems like they were fairly short-term samples, less</p> <p>10 than an hour.</p> <p>11 Q. And you then predicted a time-weighted average</p> <p>12 for those samples?</p> <p>13 A. Well, these are sample time-weighted averages,</p> <p>14 so these are just the concentrations for the sample time.</p> <p>15 We didn't extrapolate the eight hours.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So what impact would extrapolating the</p> <p>17 eight hours have on your findings?</p> <p>18 A. Well, if a person did chain-sawing the same</p> <p>19 amount of time as we did and found the same results, and</p> <p>20 then if we divided that by eight hours, it's going to go</p> <p>21 down. I mean the concentration will be less. However, if</p> <p>22 a person did this particular operation for eight hours,</p> <p>23 then that would be the eight-hour time-weighted average.</p> <p>24 Does that make any sense? This is how we try to teach our</p> <p>25 students.</p>

51 (Pages 198 to 201)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">202</p> <p>1 Q. Right. I just want to make sure that, you</p> <p>2 know, the record's clear and that I'm following it, too.</p> <p>3 So the mean PCM sample TWA -- and TWA is a time-weighted</p> <p>4 average, right?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. It's 0.72 fibers per milliliter, which is</p> <p>7 fibers per cc, right?</p> <p>8 A. Right.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And for the operator assistant, it was</p> <p>10 0.26 fibers per cc, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And the stackers, it drops to 0.07 and 0.12</p> <p>13 respectively, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And so the total mean for all tasks was 0.29</p> <p>16 fibers per cc, correct?</p> <p>17 A. Right.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Now, do you have an opinion as to the</p> <p>19 meaning of those findings or the importance of those</p> <p>20 findings?</p> <p>21 A. Well, in my opinion, they aren't very</p> <p>22 important because obviously, fibers per cc are just that,</p> <p>23 fibers. You know, there's lots of fibers in the forest.</p> <p>24 Q. Right.</p> <p>25 A. We're talking about sawdust.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">204</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And so if we were to want to compare</p> <p>2 these measurements with Amandus's data, we would use the</p> <p>3 mean -- would we use the "Mean TEM Sample TWA greater than</p> <p>4 5 microns" column?</p> <p>5 A. Well, I don't believe Amandus did any TEM. I</p> <p>6 think it was all PCM.</p> <p>7 Q. PCM, right. How would the TEM and PCM</p> <p>8 compare?</p> <p>9 A. Well, generally, we could expect -- I mean if</p> <p>10 we're just talking about -- let's say we had nothing but</p> <p>11 asbestos in this room floating around in the air, and if</p> <p>12 we did PCM versus TEM, we'd see more with TEM because of</p> <p>13 the greater magnification.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 A. If you have a mixed, where you've got</p> <p>16 different types of fibers -- see, TEM is only looking at</p> <p>17 asbestos. So if we've got mixed fibers, then we may see</p> <p>18 more with PCM. Does that make sense?</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Why would we see more with PCM?</p> <p>20 Because we wouldn't --</p> <p>21 A. Because it's going to count all fibers.</p> <p>22 Q. Right.</p> <p>23 A. So it's going to count the asbestos fibers as</p> <p>24 well as the other fibers. Do you see what I'm saying? I</p> <p>25 don't know if that makes sense.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">203</p> <p>1 Q. So we haven't, at this point, reduced it to</p> <p>2 asbestos fibers, correct?</p> <p>3 A. That's right.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. What about the mean TEM sample TWA?</p> <p>5 Are we then looking at actual asbestos fiber for these</p> <p>6 measurements?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. These are structures per square</p> <p>8 centimeter -- or per cubic centimeter --</p> <p>9 Q. And so the first --</p> <p>10 A. -- and broken down by, you know, length.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So there are two columns -- or three</p> <p>12 columns of mean TEM data, the first of which measures</p> <p>13 fibers less than 5 microns, correct?</p> <p>14 A. In length.</p> <p>15 Q. In length; in length, thank you. The second</p> <p>16 column measures fibers greater than 5 microns in length,</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And then the third column measures total</p> <p>20 asbestos fibers irrespective of length, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, but basically, it's kind of the</p> <p>22 combination of the two.</p> <p>23 Q. Right. You're basically adding them together,</p> <p>24 correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yeah.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">205</p> <p>1 Q. I do. So I'm thinking back to the exposure</p> <p>2 measurements that Amandus used which used PCM. The actual</p> <p>3 asbestos present in the air for those measurements may</p> <p>4 have been higher than what was measured -- than what was</p> <p>5 reported, rather?</p> <p>6 A. Are we going back to the Amandus?</p> <p>7 Q. Yes, not focusing on the old pre '68 data.</p> <p>8 I'm talking about like the data in the late '60s and</p> <p>9 throughout the '70s through the '80s where they reported</p> <p>10 in PCM fibers per cc.</p> <p>11 A. Well, if there were fibers present that were</p> <p>12 non asbestos, that would be the case. I don't know if</p> <p>13 that was true or not.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 A. You know, and the other -- with PCM, you just</p> <p>16 have to keep in mind that they're counting fibers, but for</p> <p>17 one thing, PCM can only see a diameter of a fiber like</p> <p>18 0.25 micrometers in diameter. So if there's real thin</p> <p>19 fibers, we're not even going to see them under the</p> <p>20 microscope, whereas with TEM, we would see it. So that's</p> <p>21 kind of another reason why we might see more TEM fibers if</p> <p>22 we had the same, the same asbestos atmosphere.</p> <p>23 Q. So is it fair to say that, and based on this</p> <p>24 paper, one of the worst-case scenarios you would</p> <p>25 anticipate in terms of exposure for a chain saw operator</p>

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">206</p> <p>1 would be 0.11 fibers per cc if we were to count all 2 fibers, including those shorter than 5 microns, correct? 3 A. Are we looking at the last column? Where are 4 we looking at? 5 Q. The last column, the chain saw operator. 6 A. Chain saw operator. So for that number of 7 samples, pretty limited number of samples, yeah, we found 8 that number. 9 Q. Right. And again, just so the record's clear, 10 this is what the paper states is a worst-case scenario of 11 potential exposure, correct? 12 A. Well, we called it "worst case" simply because 13 we felt that the mine would be most likely to have the 14 highest contamination. We were on the mine road. 15 Q. Right, right. So -- 16 A. Is that worse than being somewhere else on the 17 mine road? I don't know. 18 Q. But in terms of being somewhere in Lincoln 19 County forest area using a chain saw, an area that is away 20 from the mine, you would not expect to see exposures 21 higher than this, would you? 22 A. If we knew that the concentration in the media 23 was less, yeah. We would assume that it would be less. 24 Q. You would assume it would be less, right. 25 A. But, you know, you can't make those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">208</p> <p>1 question? 2 MR. LEWIS: But the answer is "no," he's not 3 going to be offering any testimony on that last subject. 4 (The record was read by the court reporter as 5 follows: 6 "QUESTION: But fair to say, you stated 7 earlier, at the confirmation hearing, you are not going to 8 offer an opinion about any specific individual's potential 9 exposures from having worked as a chain saw operator in 10 Lincoln County, correct? 11 "ANSWER: No.") 12 MR. STANSBURY: Is that a double negative? 13 MR. LEWIS: Yeah, it is. 14 MS. ROHRHOFER: I'm not an English major. I 15 think -- 16 MR. LEWIS: You asked if it's correct that 17 he's not going to, and he said "no." 18 But anyway, he's not, just for the record, 19 he's not going to offer any testimony as to that last 20 question. 21 MR. STANSBURY: I'll ask him one more time. 22 BY MR. STANSBURY: 23 Q. You're not going to offer any -- is it correct 24 to say that you will not offer any testimony at the 25 confirmation hearing about an individual's potential</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">207</p> <p>1 conclusions unless you knew. 2 Q. But again, you would not extrapolate these 3 measurements to other parts of the forest without some 4 form of measurement done in advance, correct? 5 A. Right. And we haven't attempted to do that. 6 Q. Okay. So I just want to make sure the 7 record's clear that you were not stating based upon this 8 paper, you believe similar exposures are occurring 9 throughout the Lincoln County forest, correct? 10 A. Right. A very limited number samples, a pilot 11 study, preliminary data, the only thing we can say from 12 this study, basically, is that if you work on contaminated 13 trees, you can put fibers into the air or get them on your 14 clothes. 15 Q. Okay. And but fair to say, you stated 16 earlier, at the confirmation hearing, you are not going to 17 offer an opinion about any specific individual's potential 18 exposures from having worked as a chain saw operator in 19 Lincoln County, correct? 20 A. No. 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. LEWIS: That's a double-negative, Counsel. 23 You asked -- I don't think you want the answer to stand as 24 stated. 25 MR. STANSBURY: Could you repeat the last</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">209</p> <p>1 exposures from sawing, hauling, or stacking wood in the 2 Libby forest? 3 A. That would be correct. 4 Q. Okay. 5 MR. STANSBURY: I appreciate you looking out 6 for me, Tom. 7 MR. LEWIS: Well -- 8 MR. STANSBURY: That's good. You're right. 9 MR. LEWIS: It doesn't have any -- he's not 10 going to testify about that. 11 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) And we stated earlier that 12 your 2009 paper was not in your expert report, correct? 13 A. Correct. 14 Q. And you don't intend to offer any testimony 15 related to that at the confirmation hearing, correct? 16 A. No. 17 Q. Okay. And again so the record's clear, we 18 looked through your report and although we did see 19 references where you were talking about medical findings, 20 you yourself are not a medical doctor, correct? 21 A. That's correct. 22 Q. You don't intend to offer any medical 23 testimony about asbestos disease, correct? 24 A. No. 25 Q. Okay. Nor are you a toxicologist, correct?</p>

53 (Pages 206 to 209)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">210</p> <p>1 A. That's correct.</p> <p>2 Q. You do not intend to offer opinions about</p> <p>3 toxicity of amphiboles in Libby, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Correct.</p> <p>5 MR. LEWIS: Don't ask these questions over</p> <p>6 again. Please don't. They're repetitive.</p> <p>7 Q. (By Mr. Stansbury) Nor are you an</p> <p>8 epidemiologist, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. You're not going to offer epidemiological</p> <p>11 opinions, correct?</p> <p>12 A. That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. STANSBURY: Pass the witness.</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Okay. Did we get -- what you</p> <p>16 referred to as the "Amandus study", was that marked?</p> <p>17 MR. STANSBURY: I believe it was.</p> <p>18 MR. LEWIS: Is that 7?</p> <p>19 MS. ROHRHOFER: Yeah, Exhibit 7.</p> <p>20 MR. LEWIS: Okay, thanks. Let me check. I</p> <p>21 probably don't have any questions.</p> <p>22 (Pause in proceedings.)</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 BY MR. SPEAR:</p> <p>25 Q. I guess I want to clarify one thing,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">212</p> <p>1 Q. All right.</p> <p>2 A. I mean I just know that because of our work</p> <p>3 with the Forest Service, we had to have access to that</p> <p>4 map. I mean we've, we've been working with EPA.</p> <p>5 Q. And that's the Forest Service work that you're</p> <p>6 engaged in right now that's not been completed --</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. -- is that correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. All right. Do you know where that map can be</p> <p>11 found?</p> <p>12 A. I don't know what you mean. I have it, the</p> <p>13 Forest Service has it, EPA has it. I don't know if</p> <p>14 they've released the map.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay.</p> <p>16 A. I just don't know. I'm just being honest with</p> <p>17 you, I don't know.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay.</p> <p>19 A. I mean it isn't in a publication because we</p> <p>20 don't, we don't know if we have the right to put that in</p> <p>21 there.</p> <p>22 Q. And you do not, is it -- I don't know if you</p> <p>23 testified about this: Do you or do you not intend to rely</p> <p>24 on that map for your testimony in this case?</p> <p>25 A. Well, to me, it described the spread of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">211</p> <p>1 Dr. Spear. The EPA studies that you considered, you</p> <p>2 referred to some studies by Paul Peronard. Do you recall</p> <p>3 that?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Are those studies that you referenced all</p> <p>6 publicly available?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. They're on the EPA Web site, I believe.</p> <p>8 Q. Is that how you obtained them?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And does that include the bark studies</p> <p>11 and the map prepared by the EPA? Is that on the Web site</p> <p>12 as well?</p> <p>13 A. That's a good question.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know when that study and that map was</p> <p>15 made available to the public or -- let me finish. Let me</p> <p>16 withdraw the question.</p> <p>17 Do you know when that EPA study, the bark study and</p> <p>18 the map that you described, was issued by the EPA?</p> <p>19 A. My recollection is it was in 2008.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know if it was before or after your</p> <p>21 report?</p> <p>22 A. Before or after this report.</p> <p>23 Q. Your expert report.</p> <p>24 A. My expert report. I guess I don't know the</p> <p>25 exact timeline.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">213</p> <p>1 asbestos from the, from the mine. But I don't -- I</p> <p>2 haven't offered it as an opinion, so I just brought it up</p> <p>3 in the case of cross-examination, so I probably wouldn't</p> <p>4 rely on it.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. You, in your report --</p> <p>6 MR. LEWIS: Excuse me, Counsel.</p> <p>7 Q. (By Mr. Lewis) I'll refer you to Exhibit 4.</p> <p>8 You talk about a harvest location.</p> <p>9 A. Looking at the map?</p> <p>10 Q. Yes, it's Figure 1 on page 719.</p> <p>11 A. Okay.</p> <p>12 Q. I want to clarify. The harvest location was</p> <p>13 not on the mine site. Is that true or untrue?</p> <p>14 A. That is true.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Do you know where the screening, what</p> <p>16 has been called the "screening plant" is located on the</p> <p>17 Kootenai River?</p> <p>18 A. By the -- yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Is that at the intersection of the</p> <p>20 river and Rainey Creek Road?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. How far was the harvest location from the</p> <p>23 screening plant?</p> <p>24 A. Well, what did we say -- whatever the distance</p> <p>25 was given up that road. I think we state 1.5 kilometers.</p>

54 (Pages 210 to 213)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

<p style="text-align: right;">214</p> <p>1 Q. Okay.</p> <p>2 A. From Highway 37, so we add another --</p> <p>3 Q. So less than a mile?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. That's all I have.</p> <p>6 MR. LEWIS: I'll reserve the rest of my</p> <p>7 questions in time of -- until the confirmation hearing.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 BY MR. STANSBURY:</p> <p>10 Q. Just one quick clarifying point. The harvest</p> <p>11 location was not on the mine, but it was in the</p> <p>12 EPA-restricted zone, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 VIDEOGRAPHER: Anybody else on the line?</p> <p>16 Everybody done?</p> <p>17 MR. LEWIS: Are there any questions?</p> <p>18 MR. STANSBURY: Going once, twice. All right,</p> <p>19 everybody.</p> <p>20 VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This concludes the</p> <p>21 videotaped deposition of Dr. Terry Spear in the matter of</p> <p>22 W.R. Grace & Company, et al., Debtors.</p> <p>23 The time is 1:37. It's July 29, 2009.</p> <p>24 We're off the record.</p> <p>25 * * * * *</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">216</p> <p>1 DEPOSITION OF: TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.</p> <p>2 DEPOSITION DATE: JULY 29, 2009</p> <p>3 IN RE: W.R. Grace & Co, Debtor</p> <p>4 COURT REPORTER: CANDICE L. NORDHAGEN</p> <p>5 I have read my deposition and make the following</p> <p>6 corrections or additions:</p> <p>7 PAGE # LINE CORRECTION</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 Signed under penalty of perjury this _____ day of</p> <p>23 _____, _____.</p> <p>24 _____</p> <p>25 Terry M. Spear, Ph.D.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">215</p> <p>1 STATE OF MONTANA)</p> <p>2 : ss.</p> <p>3 County of Silver Bow)</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 I, Candice L. Nordhagen, Registered Professional</p> <p>6 Reporter, Notary Public in and for the County of Silver</p> <p>7 Bow, State of Montana, do hereby certify:</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 That the witness in the foregoing deposition, Terry</p> <p>10 M. Spear, Ph.D., was by me first duly sworn according to</p> <p>11 law in the foregoing cause; that the deposition was then</p> <p>12 taken before me at the time and place herein named; that</p> <p>13 the deposition was reported by me in machine shorthand and</p> <p>14 later transcribed by computer, and that the foregoing two</p> <p>15 hundred fourteen (214) pages contain a true record of the</p> <p>16 witness, all done to the best of my skill and ability.</p> <p>17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and</p> <p>18 affixed my notarial seal this _____ day of _____,</p> <p>19 2009.</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 _____</p> <p>22 Candice L. Nordhagen</p> <p>23 Notary Public for the State of</p> <p>24 Montana residing at Butte,</p> <p>25 Montana. My commission</p> <p>(NOTARIAL SEAL) expires September 15, 2011.</p>	

55 (Pages 214 to 216)

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

A			
abbreviated 21:10	add 53:13 151:18	93:21 94:8,11,13	173:19 204:2
ability 9:19 177:5,6	214:2	102:2 103:21 104:1	ambient 15:20,22
215:16	adding 203:23	114:20 115:4,13	16:4,8 17:21 76:15
able 32:24 115:4	addition 107:12	116:2 119:17,21	80:9 90:18,22 93:21
167:2 176:7 177:3,5	additional 137:11	121:24 122:23	103:21 119:17
177:7 179:18 192:1	138:9 166:21	123:1,6 127:11,12	ambiguity 147:16
199:25	additions 216:5	127:14,17 128:20	ambiguous 138:21
abnormalities 45:15	address 44:3 139:17	128:22,23 129:13	American 30:10,11
45:24 46:4,19 48:1	152:1 154:7	129:17 173:23	131:17
52:20 53:21 54:11	addresses 46:2,21	174:25 176:14	amount 123:5,6
132:17	47:10 100:9	177:6 179:6,6,9	129:12 135:4
absence 11:13	adequately 100:16	181:2 190:19,22	156:10 174:12
access 147:10 165:8	adjacent 189:15	204:11 205:3	178:18 179:4
186:9 212:3	administered 1:8	207:13	201:19
account 134:21 144:6	52:6,11 53:17	airborne 80:11 115:4	amounts 64:25
195:22,23	administering 51:23	119:13 122:1	amphibole 5:20
accrued 125:15	administration	123:12 124:13	14:16 35:21 36:22
accumulating 134:11	141:13,18,22	140:16,20 165:18	39:9,14,22,22 40:6
accumulative 137:2	administrative 72:20	174:2,8,10 199:16	40:10,16 45:3 47:3
accuracy 153:10	administrator 85:17	199:22 200:1 201:6	54:3 58:23 59:1
accurate 178:3	advance 207:4	airshed 91:12 93:2	72:16 75:2 84:1
179:23	advisor 42:14 93:17	al 1:7 6:18 214:22	109:22,24 110:15
accurately 124:1	125:17	Alan 3:5,7 7:8,11	139:25 156:21
155:4,10,15	aerodynamic 114:4	103:19	168:22 172:13,16
act 97:23 98:1	affirmative 99:21	alanrich 7:11	172:20 175:19,23
acted 98:4	affirmatively 182:17	Albany 175:18	177:1,24 178:12,13
action 118:17 127:6	affixed 215:18	176:20 177:2	179:19 182:20
actions 99:2,3	agencies 140:21	alcohol 21:20	188:8
activities 24:24 25:6	143:5	allegations 70:9	amphiboles 38:17,18
25:7,8,9 77:17,18	agency 115:1,16	alleged 76:14	40:7,11,18,19,20
80:12 121:18,21	141:14	allow 123:11 124:12	138:18 170:8,10
126:22 169:9	ago 26:18 30:3	allowed 42:11,23	196:4,5 210:3
189:12 190:1 193:1	115:21 166:4,4	allowing 117:12	amphobile 78:5
193:7,9,12 199:17	agree 82:7 89:21	already-expanded	79:23 119:20
activity 15:24 16:8	104:11 134:9 138:2	160:21	Anaconda 29:6
17:22 18:6,21 83:20	141:5,6 153:20	alternating 11:10	analysis 24:5 51:16
90:9 94:4 121:17	171:8 189:7	alternatives 106:11	112:1 120:12
190:4 191:5,11	agreed 71:10	Amandus 103:18	133:12 135:21
192:2	agreement 98:12	106:23 110:12	136:8 137:19
activity-based	AHERA 173:6	130:18,20 131:16	146:13 149:20
124:25 125:4	aim 79:21	131:24 132:11	154:24 160:1
actual 10:8 61:7	aimed 30:15 78:18	138:15 139:13,20	166:23 170:22
135:24 163:11	air 13:12 15:20,22	149:5,24 155:2,8	176:12,15 177:5
168:11 170:1	16:4,8 17:21 18:17	191:17 204:5 205:2	179:7 180:22
174:20 184:19	18:17 21:5,6,9 22:4	205:6 210:16	185:16 187:8
203:5 205:2	76:15 80:9 90:8,18	Amandus's 140:6	analyst 177:21
	90:22 91:19 92:19	154:25 155:25	analytical 134:14,16

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

176:4,6,8,13,16,19 176:22 177:12 178:1,15,19,21,24 179:7,17 analyze 177:8,10 analyzed 170:21 171:25 172:9 analyzing 27:22 121:23 178:5 Andrij 75:4 and/or 142:4 Annals 31:5 77:13 answer 9:19 23:8 25:3 26:18 30:22 31:25 33:16 36:2,11 42:22 48:13,14,20 49:6 53:11 54:24 58:21 95:18 97:18 123:23 126:2 152:7 207:23 208:2,11 antecedent 138:22 anticipate 205:25 anybody 7:5,17,20 72:24 214:15 anyway 185:7 208:18 appear 60:12 135:7 appearances 2:1 3:1 4:1 6:6 appears 148:1 164:4 164:10,18 apples-to-apples 173:20 applicable 108:21 applied 178:24 179:21 applies 153:23 apply 137:23 146:17 apportionment 92:18 appreciate 34:5 101:9 123:22,24 209:5 approach 137:7 141:5,7 143:8 168:5 186:25 188:19,21 188:24 approximately 52:19 52:24 53:17	area 15:25 26:2 31:19 108:11 126:13 132:8 133:3 140:24 151:16,23 152:13,14 157:2 163:19 165:1 166:5 169:21 175:7 178:4 181:17 184:20 186:3,7 187:12 189:11 190:9 192:5 206:19,19 areas 32:7 72:13 92:1 140:23 150:11 151:8,15 152:18 153:1,15 154:3 160:4 162:17 165:20,21 170:4 180:19 186:9,14 188:20 189:15 arguably 109:16 argumentative 152:5 arisen 82:17 arising 75:20 114:1 arose 148:14 arrangement 11:12 artfully 163:6 article 5:19,20 28:19 44:7 59:3 74:13,16 75:9,11 76:22 78:11 94:1 140:8 articles 29:9,22,25 30:4 31:4,13,15 58:24,25 60:3 113:11 118:14 article's 75:14 Asa 180:3,12 asbestos 2:19 7:7 12:19,21,23 13:1,24 14:4,7,9,10,14,15 14:16 15:6,9,19 16:3 17:20,21 18:6 18:16 21:21 23:11 27:5,15,17 28:3,4 28:10,20,25 29:1,8 29:14 30:5 31:9,17 31:19 32:5,9 33:4,5 34:3,3,8,11,14,17	34:23 35:13,15,21 35:22 36:1 37:3,4,6 37:9,10,21 38:5,7 38:14,15,16 45:5 46:9 50:15,16 54:12 59:1 61:4 75:11 76:9,15,21 77:7,18 78:12,16 79:23 80:2 80:7 93:5,14 94:21 95:6 96:1,8 100:4 101:25 102:3 109:12,25 111:13 112:2,18,23 113:2 113:13,16 114:4,20 115:3,8,15,23 116:1 118:4,22,25 119:4,8 119:16,20 120:7,22 121:12,14,19 122:3 122:4,9,13,19 123:5 123:6,12 124:13,17 125:10 126:17 127:5,14 128:15,24 129:3,10,12,13,16 129:17 130:7 134:12,24 137:6 138:4,5 148:9,18 155:10,15 157:11 157:13 158:5,8,13 159:10,14,19 160:9 160:23 163:11,14 165:17,19 166:3 167:3 168:10,15,18 168:22 169:2,7,11 169:16,20,25 170:22,24 172:2 174:21,23,25 180:10 181:10,24 182:4 188:15,22,24 189:13,23 190:2,6,8 191:8 195:14,15,25 196:2,11,12,14 200:2 203:2,5,20 204:11,17,23 205:3 205:12,22 209:23 213:1 asbestosis 35:7 asbestos-containing	14:18 29:6 asbestos-contamin... 126:12 asbestos-related 26:9 26:11 32:25 35:5 59:23 ash 79:25 aside 89:10 161:17 asked 36:8 42:16 65:9 69:15 70:10 76:17 83:3 122:16 162:21 185:6 207:23 208:16 asking 27:8 34:5 128:14 asks 51:8 aspect 123:3 151:13 aspects 16:24 30:24 32:9 70:12,13 123:2 assess 156:15 191:8 assessing 156:18 assessment 68:7 133:25 assist 193:18 assistant 4:23 202:9 associated 14:16 34:23 54:11 113:1 133:8 146:3 160:13 169:9 176:17 195:18 Association 30:11,12 assume 36:8 136:11 186:2 206:23,24 assumed 185:19 assumes 123:15,18 123:20 assuming 138:11 assumptions 39:24 153:14 assure 13:16 Atkinson's 118:11 120:1 atmosphere 91:25 92:1,4 93:15 205:22 atmospheric 90:13 91:5,8,11 ATSDR 51:16,25
--	---	--	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

95:10	a.m 1:25	177:4 185:15	98:1 100:21 101:2
ATSDR's 51:18		205:23 207:7	102:6 104:7 105:16
attempt 154:6 174:7	B	bases 167:21	105:18 128:23
187:10 190:18	B 3:5 5:14 52:8	basic 60:10 89:18	129:1 133:18
196:19	BA 67:16	basically 11:17 15:15	143:12,21 144:5
attempted 207:5	bachelor's 10:20	16:21 21:20 40:22	145:23 146:14
attic 14:21,25 15:1,3	back 7:10 11:11,14	54:5 65:8 76:20	151:11 157:19
17:16,24 18:8,10	11:15,17 28:21 31:7	79:13 82:25 86:12	158:10 159:8 162:5
121:24 159:13	33:7 38:14 40:13	118:1 133:12	162:23 163:17
160:16,20 161:1	49:10,20 59:7 124:5	159:24 166:18,19	170:15 184:24
162:3	127:12 139:8	167:25 173:7	187:7,19 193:8,14
attics 17:16	154:18 163:16	183:16 186:8,13	197:8 198:5 199:7
attorney 2:5,13,22	171:14 172:11	187:1 193:16	200:10 204:5 207:8
3:6,16 4:6,15 69:13	173:8 175:15	198:20 203:21,23	210:17 211:7
attribute 181:21,22	177:22 187:23	207:12	benefit 9:15
attributing 127:13	188:20 194:23	basis 30:9 43:5,8	Bernard 2:21 7:6
audible 9:9	197:8 205:1,6	48:24 59:25 60:1,5	best 76:11 118:23
auditing 68:5	background 10:18,19	84:23 91:13,15	154:15 177:19,20
authored 22:15	26:17 88:21 108:10	118:9,10 119:23	194:1 215:16
authoritative 111:11	BAILOR 2:21	200:8	bet 66:12
authors 75:3 85:18	bankruptcy 1:1 8:9	batch 171:16	better 92:15
131:16 199:10	bargain 194:11	Baylor 7:6,6	beyond 14:5 15:9
automobile 92:19	bark 23:23 75:11,12	bearing 20:17	112:11 185:11
93:9	165:25 166:3,3,11	began 18:25 19:10	bias 152:21,24
available 22:17 39:5	166:17,21 167:10	125:21 167:20	big 61:9 177:15
112:12 113:14	167:11,20,22	beginning 153:8	194:10
153:17 211:6,15	172:13,17,20	begins 129:10	bit 12:4 19:22 75:10
Avenue 1:22 4:8 6:20	173:22,24 174:5,12	begun 70:25	83:2 100:25 156:14
average 47:23 144:10	175:7,24 177:2,15	behalf 18:24 75:23	163:5
144:19 151:5 165:9	177:18,24 178:12	76:1,9 81:6 85:9	Black 41:21 42:13
201:11,23 202:4	179:4,5,19 180:14	behaved 116:2	43:7 47:5,9 48:4
averaged 47:25	180:24 181:5,20	156:21	50:13 56:21,21,24
averages 201:13	182:21,23 183:13	believe 11:6,13 12:8	56:25 57:6,16,20
avoid 9:14	183:14,18,25 184:4	15:14 16:15 20:4,24	58:15
awarded 11:6	185:9 188:6 195:15	21:24 22:1 25:3	block 106:12,12
aware 18:4,13 23:15	196:6 199:19,22	26:14 30:16 39:23	blown 18:16,17
23:17 34:7,21 39:5	200:2 211:10,17	42:20,25 46:6 47:19	128:24 183:11
46:7 52:14 57:16,20	barks 174:21,23	50:14 52:2,23 53:5	blows 127:19
57:24 58:1,5 79:16	barrier 115:9	53:20 55:16,18 56:8	board 146:18
82:12,16 93:7 96:14	based 27:23 35:18	57:3,23 60:4,7	botanist 183:22,23
102:6 111:10	37:25 39:12 40:24	68:25 69:3,3 70:3,8	bottom 150:8
123:11 124:12,15	41:3 51:7 58:15	70:10,14 71:16,25	bound 120:2
128:10,12 129:11	60:19 61:2 62:22	73:12 75:21 76:7	boundaries 15:16
131:1 132:10 134:1	83:7,20 85:22 89:8	80:3 83:24 84:9	Bove 4:16
155:3,9,14 170:7,17	94:5,15 126:22	86:22 87:1,24 88:4	Bow 215:3,7
awhile 44:8 45:20	136:16 138:18	92:25 93:11 94:19	bowl 90:9,10 91:13
A-L-A-N 7:11	142:24 145:5 171:6	94:24 95:14 97:23	93:2 94:5

Box 2:15	173:6 206:12	38:5 138:5	156:19
Boy 21:5	213:16	caveat 113:5 151:18	changing 145:9
Brad 58:15	calling 171:22	cc 47:24 103:22	Chapter 1:5
branches 194:20	cancer 35:2 36:4,17	134:15 135:13	characterize 108:3
break 66:15,16	37:2,5,7,10 102:1	144:10,19 145:3	155:15 192:15
129:20,21 196:23	Candi 6:22	146:10,24 147:13	characterizes 155:10
breaks 45:17	Candice 6:7 215:5,21	147:16 148:3	characterizing
breathes 135:10	216:4	149:11,22,23	156:13
breathing 21:12,15	capable 94:12	172:23 202:7,10,16	check 210:20
21:23 83:21 103:25	capacity 192:5	202:22 205:10	Cherin 4:7
195:8,12 200:22	Caplin 2:23	206:1	choice 149:8
Brian 2:4 7:1 8:8	captures 155:4	ceiling 115:12	chop 198:2,18
brief 66:19 197:3	car 162:16	Cellarosi 4:5 7:15,15	chopped 198:4
briefly 12:10 48:18	carcinogenic 102:2	cement 158:23 159:2	Chris 127:5 128:21
49:5,7 70:6	card 56:25 57:4,5	center 3:18 169:15	Christopher 126:3,6
Brienne 78:7	58:12	centimeter 103:17,23	chronology 69:6
broad 26:24	carrying 18:22	176:2 178:13 203:8	chrysotile 50:16
broadening 29:1	case 1:7 4:23 6:17	203:8	159:6 188:21
broken 173:9,9	20:18 23:1,5 36:21	central 31:12 100:11	Chtd 2:23
203:10	60:19,23 63:20 64:1	certain 46:12 61:20	circle 2:24 186:3
brought 162:15	75:16 76:1,6 81:12	136:9,16 152:23	circumstances
213:2	81:24 82:14 83:10	156:10 178:4	191:23
brush 193:20 195:18	86:1 87:25 105:10	183:10 184:11	citation 102:3 126:23
195:19	105:15 158:7 160:8	189:12 190:1	126:25
Building 4:17	175:13 182:16	certainly 12:25 29:6	citations 129:5
buildings 115:15	192:3 205:12	31:14 32:3 36:19	cite 95:6 111:22
126:11,18	206:12 212:24	55:1 60:8 63:12	114:25 115:20
bulk 119:10 173:25	213:3	72:5 86:23 90:25	185:6
174:11 176:15,15	cases 17:17 39:18	91:7 107:18 108:6	cited 93:24 128:3,4
177:9 190:19 200:1	60:20 68:10 86:24	121:13 122:23	140:9
bunch 194:1	133:8 147:13	123:1 129:15 140:9	cities 159:17
burn 79:23	Casualty 4:12 7:16	145:12,14 146:13	citing 102:5 103:18
burned 78:16	7:19	148:18 150:23	126:8 148:24
burning 78:6 80:2	categories 19:5 45:21	157:2 161:10 174:7	Civil 48:17
Butte 1:23 6:2,21	category 54:7	175:12 179:18	CLAIMAINTS 2:11
215:23	cause 37:6,21 40:19	182:12,15	claimant 65:6,23
buy 189:19	59:23 60:5,19 61:2	certify 215:7	82:11
bystander 116:8,10	61:12,22 80:14	chain 191:11 194:8,9	claimants 2:19 7:4,7
116:14,15,18,19,24	82:21,24 83:5,13	194:11,13,15	64:13,19,25 65:16
117:3,4,8	84:2,21 115:14	200:25 205:25	81:7 82:12
	137:24 144:1	206:5,6,19 207:18	claimant's 65:21
C	215:11	208:9	clarification 89:15
C 4:14 103:19	caused 54:2 62:2	chain-sawer 193:18	117:13
calculated 144:11	112:18 162:18,19	193:19,25	clarified 155:8
call 16:8 69:20,23	causer 36:23	chain-sawing 201:18	clarify 26:23 27:11
120:23	causes 61:16	change 196:24	28:8 92:16 210:25
called 7:23 166:7	causing 35:22 37:9	changed 95:20 116:2	213:12

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

clarifying 214:10	179:9 186:13,16	28:4 63:14 68:4,12	74:3 90:24 116:16
class 12:10,17,18,22	192:10	68:17 97:23 98:1	122:22
12:25 151:15,17,22	collected 119:7	company 96:13,22	concerning 32:5
152:15	127:11,12 140:18	97:2,9,13 99:19	63:19
classes 11:10,15	140:21,25 142:1,4,7	100:15 102:12	concerns 139:18
13:21,21	142:10,14 143:2	140:23 142:13	concluded 129:1
classification 184:1	144:11 166:5,6	214:22	concludes 196:25
classifying 152:18	167:14 179:5 201:5	company's 97:10,15	214:20
clean 9:10 99:12	collecting 13:17	compare 173:18	Conclusion 187:23
162:25	176:11	174:7 190:18,20	199:8
clear 9:16 12:5 19:2	Columbia 3:18	204:1,8	conclusions 27:22
22:13 24:12 25:9	column 165:15	compared 37:21	161:15 171:8
41:9 45:6 48:8	167:13 199:8	62:22 91:25 92:5,7	185:13,15,23 207:1
49:24 74:12 75:10	203:16,19 204:4	136:5 137:2 169:8	conditions 89:16,23
84:5 96:11 103:15	206:3,5	191:1,7	90:5,14 91:6,8
107:15 116:20	columns 203:11,12	compares 123:5	95:16,24 96:18
119:22 126:7	combination 40:20	148:2	101:14 102:22
135:12 140:22	203:22	comparison 92:12	108:10 113:25
153:22 163:23	combining 153:13	173:20	114:2 117:22
187:15,22 196:18	come 43:22 95:22	compensate 153:5	155:16
202:2 206:9 207:7	98:12 181:9 186:17	154:13	conduct 26:1 28:6,9
209:17	comes 40:22 48:3	compensated 85:1,22	97:11,15,17 98:9,11
clearance 180:20	200:14	compensation 86:5	99:5,6,7,8,12,16
clearing 25:11	comfortable 89:22	completed 23:2 212:6	100:7,21 101:21
193:19	99:6 186:22	completely 9:20	102:12,21,25 103:4
clearly 62:18 102:4	coming 11:11 125:5	compliance 68:5	103:5 104:7,14,17
126:10 128:16,16	126:21 181:25	complicated 127:20	104:20,23 105:1,3,3
132:7	195:14,15	comply 72:9	105:6,14,22 106:2,6
cleavage 173:11	comment 37:23	component 62:8	107:4,4,7,9,11,13
clinic 56:25 57:4,5	commented 71:22	composite 22:8	107:19,22,25
58:12	commercial 126:11	compound 28:12	108:12,24 109:17
clinical 60:10	126:18	30:20 36:10 51:4	156:7,15 174:13
clinics 60:11	commission 215:23	58:18 99:23 139:3	conducted 26:10 27:5
close 50:23 178:20	Committee 2:19 7:7	comprehensive 28:7	127:22 197:15
clothes 18:22 207:14	common 95:6,8	28:9,15 149:20	198:12
clothing 21:7 31:1	118:25 134:23	187:10	conducting 100:4
cloud 91:4	143:15	computer 215:14	170:19
coach 23:7 26:15	communities 17:6	concede 63:18	Conference 30:12
33:15 48:19 139:5,6	community 90:7	concentrate 78:21	confidence 144:1
coaching 26:20,22	94:21 95:3 100:14	concentration 185:10	confirmation 51:3
48:22 49:2 123:21	100:17,22 102:4,7	186:1 201:21	59:14 64:10 87:21
COBRE 19:1,10	104:4 108:19	206:22	89:8 130:14 193:4
159:23	111:10 112:17	concentrations 45:4	207:16 208:7,25
code 97:10,15,17	114:1 116:7 161:16	201:14	209:15 214:7
cohort 132:21 151:6	161:18 162:12	concern 80:1,4,6,17	conflict 73:19 74:4
cohorts 31:9 35:25	community's 109:12	83:1 84:3	conflicts 86:10
collect 27:9 62:16	companies 10:17	concerned 13:2 27:12	confused 67:8

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

confusing 28:17	186:4 188:5 189:5	32:17,19,20,25 33:1	112:13,14,18,23
conjunction 122:24	191:3 207:12	34:8,11,12,15,18,19	113:2,7,22 114:2,17
connection 68:21	contamination 15:17	34:23,24,25 35:5,6	115:21,24 116:7
75:16 76:5 101:25	115:6,8 122:1	35:7,9 36:6,14	117:2,16 119:10,13
Connolly 4:16	127:15 188:9	38:10 39:10,14,16	120:14 121:15
connotations 116:14	206:14	39:19 40:7,11,25	122:5,10 125:14,19
consider 28:14 98:8	contending 170:15	41:4,14 43:9,25	125:22 126:18
106:11 138:6	content 109:21	44:16,17,18,20,23	128:17,25 129:17
143:22 157:3	118:25	45:7,12,15,18,21,25	129:18 130:8,11,12
consideration 107:18	contents 75:12	46:5,6,19,22,23	131:2,5 132:1,2,5
considered 31:6	contesting 138:7	47:3,11,14,18,19	132:11,18,22,25
60:15 86:2,3 118:5	context 53:16	50:18 51:13,16,20	133:1,3,20 134:6,7
118:22 150:12	continue 29:24 50:20	52:1,2,4,6,9,12,20	134:9,23,25 135:5,8
152:14 153:12	73:16	52:25 53:1,21 54:15	135:16,21,25 136:2
211:1	Continued 3:1 4:1	54:16,19,20 55:3,9	136:6,13,17,20,24
considering 110:14	continues 101:16	55:12 56:18,22	137:4,8,9,13,16
133:24	contributing 92:18	57:17 58:3,7,8,16	138:12,19 140:2
considers 120:1	control 31:3 72:19,21	59:17,18,20,21 61:3	141:9,16 142:1,4,7
consistently 134:20	114:10,11 175:16	61:8 62:9,14,23,24	142:11,14,17,21,25
constituted 108:20	177:13 184:17,19	63:7,11 64:10 65:13	143:3,5 144:13,19
constitutes 63:23	controlled 76:21	67:17,20,23 68:19	145:3,5,13 146:7,11
187:7	controlling 62:17	71:11,24 72:3,11	146:14,21,24 147:3
constraints 153:17	controls 72:20,20	73:23 74:6 75:12,16	147:7,10,13,17,23
constructed 25:22	114:12	75:23 76:10,15	148:3,14 149:3,7
constructing 25:21	conversation 69:18	77:14,19 78:9,13,25	150:25 152:3,19,23
construction 25:18	conversations 47:9	79:17,20 80:7,9,12	153:24 154:10,14
25:19	56:21 58:9,15 73:11	80:15,16,18 81:14	154:21 155:20,25
consultant 75:15	73:12	81:24 82:5,11 83:5	156:3,7,11,17,25
76:13	conversion 146:17,19	83:8,10 84:21,24	157:6,9,18,20 158:2
consultation 68:3,9	147:2,23 148:1	85:2,10,14,15,19,23	158:5,8,12 159:7,14
consulting 14:10,12	153:14	86:2,25 88:6,10,23	160:10,11,21,25
contact 7:10	convert 147:20	89:1,5,11,17,20	161:5,8,13 162:9,20
contacted 69:5	149:10	90:14 93:3 94:1,2	163:3,8,12,14,19,20
contacting 69:9	converting 146:10	94:16,22,24 95:7,12	164:2,5,20 165:1,5
contain 31:8 121:23	147:16 149:23	95:13,17 96:1,5,8	165:11,25 166:13
215:15	cooperated 106:16	96:15,20,24 97:2,11	166:22,25 167:1,3,4
contained 64:4	copies 66:15 128:10	97:15 98:6,16,18,20	167:8 172:3,6,12,14
119:21 120:3 121:1	128:11	99:3,9,13,22 100:23	172:23 173:5,15,21
132:25 159:6 175:8	copper 29:5	101:3,5,11,18,21	174:17,23 175:5,13
containing 115:15	copy 84:13 87:14	102:7,10,11,13,14	175:14,16,19,20,21
118:4,22 129:10	core 167:14,19,23	102:23 103:23	175:24 176:2,20,24
contaminants 13:11	correct 8:10,17 17:17	104:4 105:6,10,12	177:3 178:1,13,16
185:20	19:20,21 21:25	105:15,17,20	178:19,23 179:13
contaminate 115:5	22:15,18,19 23:16	106:23 107:19	179:20 180:5,8,14
contaminated 78:6	23:20 24:1,8,24	109:14,18,22	180:20 181:5,10,14
78:16 79:23 83:19	27:23,24 30:15,16	110:13,17 111:12	181:17 182:8
122:14 162:17	30:19 32:13,14,16	111:23 112:7,9,10	184:22 185:17,23

185:24 187:18 188:17 189:13,18 189:24 190:3,7,11 190:14,20,23 191:1 191:9,19,25 192:21 193:1,4,10 194:21 194:24 195:2,5,6,8 195:10,16 196:3,6,8 196:11,15 199:5,18 199:19,20 200:6,23 201:1 202:10,13,16 203:2,13,17,20,24 206:2,11 207:4,9,19 208:10,16,23 209:3 209:12,13,15,20,21 209:23,25 210:1,3,4 210:8,9,11,12 212:8 214:12 corrected 190:18 CORRECTION 216:7 corrections 216:5 correctly 42:6 68:2 68:13 75:7 77:11 90:6,11 96:11 100:18 103:9 106:9 106:14 108:22 112:4 113:19 114:23 115:18 118:6 126:9,15 131:19 141:3 150:13 151:9,10 153:18 165:16,22 167:17 172:17 176:18 182:25 188:1,10,12 197:19 198:14 199:9,13 correlated 132:17,21 174:2 correlation 129:12 corridors 15:11 188:3 189:3 Council 29:12 counsel 2:1 6:6,24 26:15 49:16 74:20 92:6 116:13 117:12 123:24 139:7	207:22 213:6 count 22:9 103:13 135:14 148:17 176:12 177:5 204:21,23 206:1 counted 134:2,5 135:5 counting 88:4,5 135:13 138:9 140:1 205:16 country 157:16 158:12,16 188:7,14 188:20 189:22 County 21:2 169:21 185:1 189:10 192:5 199:18 206:19 207:9,19 208:10 215:3,6 couple 9:6 41:16 56:20 140:13 144:17 164:15,16 course 12:17 13:6,10 13:14,15,16 14:3 32:24 61:11 98:9,10 105:14 108:24 152:2 180:17 193:7 courses 11:19,22,24 11:24,25 12:6 coursework 13:22 court 1:1,21 6:20,22 6:25 9:15 33:7,10 42:21 48:24 49:22 65:25 77:3 82:14 109:25 124:9 139:9 139:10 140:22 208:4 216:4 Courts 48:23 cover 12:24 16:24 30:24 31:2 covered 13:15 167:21 co-author 5:18 co-counsel 6:15 create 18:7 49:13 created 146:20 Creek 164:19 184:21 197:15 200:13 213:20	crevices 182:23 183:15,17 criminal 68:22 69:16 75:16 76:13,14 Crispen 77:10 criteria 64:4 critical 62:8 cross-examination 213:3 crow 164:16 cubic 103:16,17,22 147:5 148:16 176:2 203:8 cumulative 136:19 136:24 137:16,19 138:10 151:5 191:24 192:24 current 15:18 30:5 31:20 93:16 110:17 110:20 134:15 145:15,15,17 currently 8:14 17:8 121:22 160:13 162:25 currents 115:5 Curriculum 5:16,17 Curtis 75:3 curves 151:7 cut 53:10 198:7,8,18 199:1 cutoff 179:12 CV 66:6,7 67:2,7,16 67:25 <hr/> D <hr/> D 5:1 Dallas 3:10 Damage 7:9 dangers 113:15 data 27:9 61:25 62:5 62:14 77:9 82:18 132:25 135:23 141:25 142:24 147:20,21 149:5,15 149:16,19,25 150:2 150:11,24 153:4,17 154:5,14,16 155:24	161:15 172:9 173:18,19 179:13 184:9 190:20,25 191:6,7,18,22 192:10 203:12 204:2 205:7,8 207:11 date 102:18 127:15 216:2 dated 66:7 day 47:25 152:2 165:11 215:18 216:22 days 103:13 DC 2:25 3:20 4:9 dead 198:7 deal 12:18 88:8,9 95:2 104:14,17 125:20 149:15 dealing 28:4 120:19 147:17 149:19 156:6 190:22 dealt 120:20 death 31:16 35:24 41:15 debris 195:4 Debtor 2:3 7:24 216:3 Debtors 1:9 6:15,18 214:22 Debtors-in-Possess... 6:16 decades 108:20 deceptive 124:3 decide 28:24 decision 96:23 decompose 165:18 decrease 152:19 decreasing 152:22 deeper 183:13 defendants 68:11,16 defining 13:17 27:2 degree 8:12 10:20,25 Delaware 1:2 4:19 department 10:7,9 10:10,11 24:4,5 depend 179:3
--	---	---	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

dependent 132:24	166:16 170:22	91:10 187:6	61:2,12,13,16,20,22
depending 52:21	188:8 192:12	directly 114:5 117:5	62:2 80:15,18 82:4
176:10	determining 111:12	174:2	82:16,21,25 83:1,5
deposited 165:21	136:15 151:21	director 57:3	83:13 84:2,21 85:10
174:25 182:21	181:24 192:14	disclose 80:22 81:2,5	109:12 137:23,24
188:16	develop 12:13 34:8	81:9,17 85:16 86:15	138:5 209:23
depositing 165:24	37:5 82:4 191:24	disclosed 74:5 86:4	diseases 34:22,23
deposition 1:17 6:5	199:21	105:20 106:2	35:5,12 59:23
6:14,19 8:16 66:2	developed 33:3,5	disclosing 85:8,11	dispersal 23:11
66:21 67:3 74:23	34:11,14 156:9	86:10	188:22
77:4,25 87:11 101:3	developing 50:17	disclosure 74:8 87:2	dispersed 15:21,22
130:2 131:10 197:1	62:8	discontinued 168:4	165:19
197:5 214:21 215:9	development 68:5	discuss 44:5 75:9	dispersion 15:8,12,13
215:11,13 216:1,2,5	diagnose 32:24	79:8 89:14,15 94:20	15:19 72:22
depositions 36:18	diagnosis 37:24	118:15	dispute 142:17,20
146:1 200:11	dialogue 73:16,17	discussed 26:8,11	disputes 147:9
deposits 169:6 170:1	diameter 205:17,18	27:6 31:16 51:11,12	disrupted 123:7
170:2 171:2 180:23	died 135:25 136:2	55:24 56:9 70:9	distance 184:11
depth 182:22	difference 36:16	71:7 79:9,11 135:18	197:17 213:24
derive 136:10 137:3	38:23 139:1	154:25 166:24	distances 114:21
137:8	differences 38:24	195:24	117:6
derived 123:4 143:7	39:2,6 40:14 170:8	discusses 56:14 89:18	distant 115:5
describe 12:10 55:17	different 11:24 12:14	108:2 112:16	distinct 50:10 119:12
98:23 118:23 176:7	13:16 16:22,24	113:25	121:9 173:17
described 211:18	30:24 32:8 34:3,22	discussing 69:15	distinction 33:3,14
212:25	35:14,24,25 37:4	88:23 102:22	33:22
describing 16:1,10	43:13 50:20 52:22	115:23	distinctions 160:19
17:2 92:12	60:13 88:9 93:21	discussion 12:22 43:7	distribution 64:1
description 5:15	110:15 121:13	48:4 50:24 67:14	district 1:2 69:13
102:17 141:24	126:21 143:20	111:8,19 145:24	disturbed 90:9 94:4
designed 191:14	144:3 158:11	153:8 182:19	190:4
designing 13:10	161:12 176:13,16	discussions 102:16	divide 143:18 193:16
detail 75:10	177:14,15,18,18	disease 32:9,25 33:4	divided 201:20
detect 176:7,9 177:3	179:6,8,11,22	33:6 34:8,11,15	doctor 8:10 30:22
178:4 179:18	182:10 193:17	36:6,13,25 37:16,17	31:23 32:2 40:18
detected 160:4	199:2 204:16	37:20,22 38:6,10,13	50:21 57:6,12,13
170:23 175:19,23	differentiate 175:3	40:14,15,20 41:2,8	82:22 209:20
177:25 178:18,23	195:13 196:19	41:12,16,22 42:1,3	doctors 40:22 42:15
180:7,13	differentiated 173:4	42:4 43:8,20 44:3,6	43:3
detection 178:15	195:25	44:11 45:1,3 46:8	doctor's 57:12
determine 15:16	differently 35:12	46:13,15,16,22	document 66:2 67:3
19:17 62:21 75:11	156:14	47:11,18 48:10 50:1	68:4 74:20,23 77:4
78:15 79:22 81:19	difficult 116:14	50:9,18,25 53:24	77:25 87:11 104:18
81:21 83:18,19	148:17 186:10	54:2,14,18,22 55:2	104:21,24 105:2
121:19 123:12	diffuse 59:8,10	55:15,17,19,22 56:3	107:5,8,12,23 108:1
124:13 125:5 132:3	direction 74:9	56:6,13,18 58:10	108:6 112:20
136:16 138:5,10	directions 26:3 91:6	59:4 60:6,14,19,19	115:16 117:24

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

131:10,22 165:14 167:6 documented 115:7 documents 125:16,18 125:19 127:14 128:18 doing 14:8,17 15:15 19:4 20:9 29:4 69:4 73:23 78:21 79:14 79:16 81:18,20,21 84:17,18 91:9 93:18 117:5 119:12 122:12 123:22 124:25 139:22 154:15 160:14 167:20 176:12,14 176:14 180:22 183:25 191:11 195:10 198:21 Doll 29:21 dotcom 7:12 double 208:12 double-negative 207:22 doubts 200:12 downtown 103:13 Dr 6:14 8:16 27:4 41:21 42:13 43:7,15 43:18 45:11 47:5,9 48:4 50:13 55:5,16 56:21,21,24,25 57:6 57:16,20 58:15 66:5 66:6,21 103:19 104:2 130:2,5,17 134:9 138:15,23 139:13,20 140:6 154:20,25 155:2,3 163:24 170:22 197:1,5 211:1 214:21 draw 37:24 161:15 185:13 drawing 171:7 drive 136:6 driveways 125:6 dropped 187:2 drops 202:12	dry 101:16 102:20 103:1,13 140:19 147:9,12 Drysdale 2:23 ductwork 79:25 due 127:15 134:14 150:10,19 186:23 duly 7:24 215:10 durable 165:17 duration 137:15 191:23 dust 15:23,25 16:4,9 18:7,14 21:20 72:19 91:4 95:6,25 110:1 120:23 121:1,2,3,23 122:23 140:16,20 181:1,4,8,9 182:1 dusty 103:11 dying 138:4 D.C 2:8 <hr/> E <hr/> E 5:1,14 Earl 101:2 earlier 17:15 19:6 25:8 41:9,17 42:17 58:13,16 83:3 102:22 122:16 135:18 148:7,25 153:24 155:20 160:16 166:13 175:2 180:17 190:17 191:17 195:25 198:18 207:16 208:7 209:11 early 44:20 46:12 125:4 127:24 183:24 easiest 183:5 easily 186:9 easy 15:17 99:16 Eckert 4:7 education 59:19 educational 10:18,19 educator 14:6 effect 135:4 139:24	140:3 151:5 effects 55:17 112:22 113:1 effort 99:11 152:1 154:13 186:5 eight 101:16 184:16 201:15,17,20,22 eighty-six 53:2 eight-hour 47:25 201:23 either 38:25 44:23 45:20 59:17 85:15 85:17 93:14 99:20 105:5 133:24 137:23 140:24 165:3 180:1 182:10 electron 171:11 Elementary 180:4,13 elevated 46:3 Eleven 53:2 elicited 122:17 Ellis 2:6 7:2 Elm 3:8,9 embedded 183:13 employed 151:8,14 152:12 employees 24:9,11 151:16 employment 10:17 enable 171:25 endangered 108:18 109:2,4,6,8 ended 181:4 Enforcement 141:12 engage 189:12 engaged 192:25 212:6 engages 190:1 engineering 72:20 English 208:14 enjoyable 194:13 ensure 10:1 entails 12:11,12 enterprise 97:14 entirely 178:2 185:24 entirety 52:24 87:20 envelope 50:20	Envirnomenal 115:16 environment 74:15 165:18 environmental 54:1 54:2 67:19,22 78:8 114:25 141:25 EPA 73:3,5 93:17,18 95:10 115:20 118:11 119:25 124:16 125:14,16 125:18,19,24 126:1 127:10 128:22 129:5,6 162:23 164:24,25 166:16 180:20 185:4,5 186:25 187:1,9 211:1,7,11,17,18 212:4,13 EPA's 94:6 185:7 187:7 EPA-restricted 197:16 198:13 199:5 214:12 epidemiologic 60:12 60:16,24 62:6,17 epidemiological 29:15,17 60:23 62:8 83:8 134:1 191:18 210:10 epidemiologist 59:16 135:19 210:8 epidemiology 59:20 60:4 equal 118:4 201:4 equipment 72:21 era 149:21 erosion 169:6 essentially 26:5 110:8 176:15 establish 64:17 121:25 122:24 established 113:13 134:23 201:1 establishing 60:5 61:15 84:19 131:25 192:20
---	--	---	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

estimate 22:2,5 143:14 151:6 192:24	169:14 179:5	50:24 63:3 68:8,15 68:18 71:11 81:3 87:5,16 93:24 103:18 104:1 148:25 166:24 209:12 211:23,24	138:5,6,8,9,10 140:10,15 141:2 142:23 144:19 145:15 149:20 150:11,19 151:6,20 151:21 152:19 153:10,12,25 154:3 154:5,23 155:5,10 155:16,24 160:20 160:25 161:10,13 162:9,19 163:11 191:9,18,22,23,24 191:25 192:12,15 192:24 205:1,25 206:11
estimated 103:12	exams 61:20	expertise 40:3 94:16 132:8 133:3	exposures 18:7 22:21 23:19 31:3 33:4,6 34:15 41:24 50:17 61:7,8,12 65:6,9,15 75:20 77:7,18 78:12 78:14,19,25 79:20 80:11 82:20,25 83:13 84:19,20 86:6 86:24 95:3 104:4 114:1 131:25 132:18 135:7 137:20 143:8,15 147:3,6,9,12 153:14 153:23 159:19 161:25 162:11 163:2 174:3,10,20 180:18 188:15 191:1,8 192:6,21 195:14 206:20 207:8,18 208:9 209:1
estimates 131:16 150:11 151:7 152:19 153:11	exchange 49:21	explain 50:6 103:15 177:19,20 179:2 183:2	
estimating 143:8 153:12	exclude 173:19	exploratory 184:14	
estimation 146:14	excluded 138:16 139:14	expose 114:4	
estimators 153:13	excluding 139:21	exposed 31:9 34:7,10 34:14 35:14,25 37:3 37:4 40:16 47:3 50:15 76:9 80:2 82:12 94:21 131:15 143:18 151:24 158:5,8,13 159:9,10 159:14 160:9 161:7 161:19 163:6 189:12 190:2	
et 1:7 6:18 214:22	exclusion 140:4	exposure 13:17 14:4 14:16 17:6,25 19:17 20:11 24:7 30:18 31:17 32:21 34:2,2 34:23 35:13 37:20 38:4 45:7,12,21,25 46:4,9 47:23 48:10 50:1,9 52:4 54:2,7 59:23 60:5,18 61:1 61:16,22,25 62:1,14 62:17,22 64:6 65:12 65:12,21,23 76:16 78:21 80:6,9 81:19 81:22 82:15,17 83:4 90:25 101:25 112:23 113:1,13 116:7,8,10,25 117:3 122:2 126:13,20 131:16 132:4,21,24 133:4,9,14 135:16 135:20 136:5,17,18 136:19,20,22,23,24 137:2,7,11,13,16	
evaluate 24:18,19 25:16 65:9,12 76:20 93:18 109:17	excuse 92:5 101:8 107:6 122:8 141:24 144:9 157:13 197:10 213:6		
evaluated 64:6 78:14 111:17	executives 102:5		
evaluating 14:15 15:16 107:19 124:17 134:20 137:10	exercise 81:21		
evaluation 77:7 133:25	exhaust 92:20 93:9		
eventually 106:20,22 134:12	exhibit 65:25 66:1,3 66:6,24 67:2,2,4,6 74:22,24 77:3,5,7 78:1,4,5,24 79:8 80:5,20,21,21,25,25 81:1,13 83:13,14 84:7 87:8,9,12,16 88:25 89:1,4 102:3 102:5 103:13 104:1 131:11,14,14 163:17 190:16 197:8 210:19 213:7		
everybody 214:16,19	exhibits 63:13 95:7,8 158:22 159:2		
everybody's 139:17	existed 95:16 170:1,2		
evidence 15:14 123:16,19,21	existence 192:21		
exact 22:11 137:18 211:25	exists 141:9		
exactly 70:5 180:15 183:10	expanded 157:23 161:9,13,20,22,24 162:1,2,3,5,9,10		
examination 5:4,5,6 8:1 116:17,18 119:9	expanding 157:15 158:2,12 159:17,25 160:8,10 161:4 162:7		
examinations 11:18 62:19	expansion 162:18		
examine 51:24 93:5 118:25 122:9	expect 41:23 54:9 135:15 204:9 206:20		
examined 7:25 51:22 75:11 78:11	experience 32:21 68:1,8 119:7 155:5 155:11		
examining 101:13	expert 5:21 40:2		
example 12:18 13:12 27:21 82:2 100:20 103:5 121:3 135:24 157:22 158:1 159:4 160:6,7 161:24			

extrapolate 187:17 199:16 201:15 207:2	falling 195:1 falls 2:16 133:3 familiar 9:3 59:7 131:21 132:14 143:7,11 155:19 156:16 157:3 158:19,21,25 168:14,24	114:20 115:8,8,12 115:14,23 116:1 119:4 120:4 124:17 133:13,19,22 134:2 134:5,12,13,14,15 134:18,20,21,24 135:3,5,10,11,13,14 135:15 136:9 137:12,12 138:9,16 139:14,21,21 140:2 140:4 144:19 145:3 146:10 147:13,16 148:2,18 149:23 150:1 160:4 165:17 165:19,25 166:11 167:23 172:13,16 172:22,25 173:4,8 173:13,19 174:23 174:25 175:3,19,23 176:1,12 177:2,24 178:4,12,13 179:16 180:7,13 182:21,22 183:10,12 184:13 188:15 196:1 202:6 202:7,10,16,22,23 202:23 203:2,13,16 203:20 204:16,17 204:21,23,24 205:10,11,16,19,21 206:1,2 207:13	174:14 185:25 186:1 188:14 finding 46:7 51:15 findings 20:13,21 24:3 37:24 45:23 46:2 138:18 140:6 142:20 160:1 175:10 184:25 186:22 187:17 199:16 201:17 202:19,20 209:19 fine 89:12 98:25 99:10 114:18 129:22 finish 211:15 fire 25:18,19,20,21 25:21 fires 24:22 firewood 5:19 19:25 76:24 77:20 78:6,13 80:2,7,12 82:15,17 83:16 191:3 197:14 198:11 firewood-harvesting 77:8 199:11 firm 81:20,20 first 7:24 9:8 13:25 18:16 28:6,9,19,24 48:10 49:13 50:1 69:4,9,17,24 70:7 73:1 111:10 114:20 118:3 150:10 153:8 156:15 172:19 180:19 203:9,12 215:10 fit 12:14 135:21 fits 147:20 five 45:21 103:12 133:15,15 167:13 179:6 flagged 151:12 flat 121:13 flies 164:17 floating 204:11 flow 89:19,19 focus 12:25 31:12 38:12 47:8 61:7
eyes 73:19 e-mail 7:9,10	familiarity 156:10 families 100:17 family 39:2,7 100:14 100:22 108:19 fan 102:20 far 25:2 26:12 45:19 128:21 164:13 166:19 186:14 188:16,16 213:22 farther 186:21 fascinating 186:19 fast-acting 35:23 fatal 42:1,5 51:1 55:3 113:14 fatality 47:17 56:17 Fate 5:20 78:5 FCR 3:3,13 4:3 7:9 7:14 federal 48:17,23 140:21 141:14 143:5 federally 118:17 feel 27:13 28:8 81:16 186:22 feet 18:22 91:6 felled 198:6 fellowship 58:6 felt 206:13 female 33:24 fertilizer 157:22 fiber 36:22 115:3 121:12,14 144:10 146:23 149:10,22 172:20 176:9 177:7 188:8 203:5 205:17 fibers 5:20 75:2 78:5 79:22 83:20,22 103:17,22 111:12 111:13,14 112:13	fiber-per-cc 191:6 fibrosis 35:9,23 36:12 37:13,14,15 field 68:6 107:14,17 Fifteen 101:12 Fifteenth 2:7 fight 24:22 figure 28:18 183:9 197:13 213:10 figures 187:23 fill 52:1 filter 140:20,24 144:11 177:7 final 23:2 finalized 23:13 find 54:9 93:19 127:1 140:6 166:19 171:2	
F			
f 103:22 face 69:25,25 face-to-face 70:7 facilities 145:22 facility 44:17 45:7,12 89:16 94:22 99:12 121:4 122:10,12 140:23 143:15 155:5 157:23 158:8 166:8 181:9 fact 19:21 39:12 47:22 73:20 110:14 152:1 158:8 160:2 179:3 192:7 198:22 factor 136:11 139:24 151:15 factored 133:14 factors 153:11 facts 123:18,21 failed 72:9 failure 99:18 fair 9:11,16,17 10:1,2 16:2,9 17:2 39:21 70:21 80:3 85:12 88:11 95:1 101:1 102:17 103:7 107:16 108:9,16 109:10 120:15 127:3 142:23 146:2 154:23 160:18 161:16,18 164:11 165:9 174:1 178:10 192:15 193:5 199:15 205:23 207:15 208:6 fairly 155:24 201:9 fall 34:22 146:3 fallen 115:14 194:20			

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

62:13 68:15 79:20 focused 23:21 93:8 189:2 focuses 45:24 131:25 focusing 205:7 folder 76:23 foliage 195:20 follow 138:1 followed 39:24,25 46:13 69:21 140:1 following 6:10 181:12 202:2 216:5 follows 7:25 49:23 115:1,2 124:10 139:11 208:5 follow-up 43:25 44:14,22 63:22 foot 103:16 147:5 148:16 forces 143:18 foregoing 215:9,11 215:14 forest 15:9 19:16,18 20:8,11,16,24 21:23 22:12 23:13,21,24 23:25 24:7,9,11,14 24:14,18,22 25:5,15 25:20 73:23 77:17 82:13 86:6 166:8,21 171:17 184:25 185:23 186:2 187:17 189:12,15 200:10 202:23 206:19 207:3,9 209:2 212:3,5,13 forestry 24:3,4 82:15 82:17 166:13,14 forests 24:18 70:23 189:10 form 28:11 32:10 33:13 37:10,25 43:12 48:11 49:1 58:20 71:20 99:8 123:14 148:6 152:6 207:4 formal 26:17,25 former 197:15	forming 58:22 forms 23:1 35:4 37:6 37:21 38:6 110:15 formulating 125:9 forth 11:16,17 194:24 forthcoming 150:24 Forty-eight 142:6 forward 23:6 found 40:11 53:20 72:14 83:22 109:25 162:23 166:11 169:20 170:4 171:15 185:8 187:1 190:14 201:19 206:7 212:11 foundation 64:15 149:13 159:3 four 17:25 18:4 19:5 40:6,10 45:21 fourteen 215:15 fourth 17:19 fragments 173:11 frame 103:1 133:11 free 27:13 28:8 friable 120:1 front 74:17 76:22 77:23 full 7:10 150:10 function 31:18 42:2 52:12,15 55:18 96:23 functions 90:8 91:13 93:2 funded 19:1,6,24 funding 19:10,11 20:6,8 <hr/> G <hr/> Gabriella 4:5 7:15 gardening 125:5 gardens 162:6 garment 21:19 gather 96:23 general 34:20 40:19 68:3 117:15,20 133:5,8 140:24	185:1 187:17 generally 23:3,10 25:25 27:15 32:18 109:11 118:5 191:4 204:9 generated 158:20 Getman 75:6 getting 72:7 116:24 180:19 193:19 give 30:2 60:22 137:12 149:12 185:10,22 given 49:8 60:25 65:9 127:11 136:9 139:22 149:9,19 151:14 153:4 165:11 166:3 171:2 174:5,11 177:25 191:24 198:20 199:22 200:1 213:25 gives 97:5 giving 51:23 go 9:6 18:6 32:6 40:13,24 41:10,18 78:17 79:24,24 112:11 151:16 157:13,14,15 163:16 171:14 180:16 184:1,12,12 185:4,7 201:20 goes 90:24 149:21 188:24 going 7:20 9:6,22 11:10 12:13 23:6 26:15 28:6 33:12,15 40:21 48:16,21 49:4 66:14 67:11,12,12 84:2 87:10 94:9 97:16 98:14 100:10 103:8 105:7 114:19 120:2 123:14 124:1 126:8 136:23 149:14 152:4,13 153:8 156:5 161:5 164:12 166:17 169:1 171:6,8	176:16 177:22 178:6,6 179:3,8 183:15,22 185:9,10 187:3,25 197:8 201:20 204:21,23 205:6,19 207:16 208:3,7,17,19,23 209:10 210:10 214:18 good 8:3,4 34:5 66:15 129:20 186:12 192:19 209:8 211:13 Gotcha 71:6 Government 68:19 68:24 69:10 71:11 71:18 72:25 74:1,4 74:5,10 75:16 76:13 81:3 86:20 131:8 Governmental 30:12 Grace 1:7 6:18 7:2 8:9 63:13 72:9,14 75:19 76:14 96:12 96:19 98:4,9,16 99:3 100:13,15 101:4,14,15,24 102:5,6,9,13 103:11 103:20 105:9 106:16 108:18 109:14 133:8 156:21 157:18 158:2 175:4 196:15 214:22 216:3 Grace's 63:6 99:18 100:21 101:20 103:5 104:7,8,14,17 104:19,22,25 105:22 106:2,6,11 107:4,7,11,22,25 156:6,15 168:23 gradients 185:10 graduate 13:19,21 gram 172:16,20 175:24 177:2,24 178:12 179:17,19 grant 19:1,6 84:12 85:17 159:23
---	--	---	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

160:13 great 2:16 66:13 180:10 greater 37:9 38:5 45:2 60:22 118:5 173:8,10 203:16 204:3,13 green 195:19,20 gross 108:20 ground 122:5 195:2,4 grounds 28:12 group 52:21 88:16 177:13 groups 13:18 143:18 143:20 growth 24:20 guess 9:2 14:4 16:19 32:6 40:4 42:16 43:13 44:14 46:25 48:2 50:5 54:25 57:10 60:13 63:8 65:10,18,22 76:2 84:2 90:20 91:11 92:15 114:16 117:10 118:23 126:1 136:14 148:7 150:9 156:22 164:15 167:13 169:22 180:25 182:2 184:18 187:13,24 189:2 190:8 192:1,11 210:25 211:24 guesstimate 151:12 153:23 guesstimates 150:12 151:4 Guidance 115:16 guidelines 86:9 Gunter 170:12 171:4 171:7,22 Gunter's 170:22	hand 25:24,25 215:17 handed 78:4 handing 66:5 67:6 74:20 78:3 131:13 handling 191:15 happen 48:6 happened 156:24 168:12 happens 184:12 191:15 happy 28:8 hard 43:22 146:17 Harlan 130:20 harmful 113:13 Harrison 1:22 6:20 Hart 75:3 77:9 78:6 86:13 Hart's 84:11 harvest 197:14,17,21 197:23 198:12,17 213:8,12,22 214:10 harvesting 5:19 19:25 20:2 76:24 77:20 80:7,12 82:5 83:16 84:7 190:17 197:14 199:4 hate 120:21 haul 198:19 hailed 162:14 188:4 189:4 hauling 209:1 hazard 28:3 68:7 103:25 118:6 120:10 137:8 hazards 72:16 97:10 97:14 111:19 125:9 156:21 head 9:10 10:7 182:17 193:15 heading 18:16 health 10:10 24:19 67:19,22 68:5 83:24 108:18 112:18,19 112:22 113:1 118:5 131:5 141:22 hearing 51:3 59:14	64:10 87:21 88:15 89:8 130:14 193:4 207:16 208:7,25 209:15 214:7 heating 78:13 held 184:13 helicopter 187:3 help 26:6 helped 86:12 helpful 116:21 hereinbefore 6:6 hereunto 215:17 Herrington 3:17 hi 69:21 high 147:6,22 181:7 higher 39:16 54:9 135:7,15 136:22,23 137:13,15,19 138:9 139:25 145:12,15 205:4 206:21 highest 54:6 180:18 185:19 206:14 highly 148:16 highway 16:23 164:19 165:7 184:21 197:17 214:2 hill 169:6 hills 194:17 historical 15:13,18 63:6,9 70:19 71:23 89:16,23 90:5 95:11 95:14,15 96:18 102:16 107:4,7,11 107:22,25 109:15 110:17 112:17,22 112:25 113:4,25 114:2,11,15 117:22 118:2 149:16,25 150:2 154:13 historically 17:9 86:16 95:23,24,25 102:23 109:18 114:13 histories 32:22 history 109:11 191:25	Hold 138:20 Holian 75:4 home 14:24 18:12 72:7,22 121:8 122:4 159:13 homes 14:19,20 17:17,24 18:6 121:23 122:18 126:11,18 160:14 honest 212:16 honestly 9:20 hope 97:25 165:12 hopefully 9:14 134:11,19 horizontally 103:2 Hospital 58:2 169:15 Hospitals 58:2 hour 71:16 85:5 198:25 201:10 hourly 85:4 hours 115:13 141:1 201:15,17,20,22 house 122:6 127:19 human 15:24 17:22 18:21 74:15 83:24 90:9 94:4 hundred 8:24 53:2 215:15 hundreds 113:11 115:7 Hutz 4:16 hygiene 8:13 10:11 11:1,2 29:13 30:11 30:12,15 31:5 60:17 68:6 72:2,10 77:14 96:4,12 100:11 107:14,17 108:21 109:3 113:12,17 117:16,20 134:24 143:16 hygienist 40:25 41:3 41:6 42:12 61:5,6 61:24 62:7,11 90:23 118:24 120:17 122:21 133:21 135:20 hygienists 61:10,11
--	--	--	---

H

H 5:14
half 186:1
hamsters 106:1

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

62:18,21 90:21 113:6,16 122:7,9 hygienist's 62:2,4,13 62:25 hypothesis 174:24 hypothetical 36:9	101:21 103:5 139:2 139:2 inactions 99:3 inadequate 104:9 include 32:15 35:7 128:9 137:11 172:25 173:11,13 211:10 included 52:3 128:7 193:9 includes 17:23 including 59:1 106:12 135:3 206:2 incorrectly 48:15 119:10 increase 127:14 135:4 152:19 increases 134:19 increasing 138:17 152:22 indicate 126:10 indicates 199:3 indicating 103:25 150:18 individual 22:9 65:6 65:20 82:11 192:25 individually 99:1 individuals 33:3,5,23 46:3 51:22 52:20 73:2,5 75:18 76:9 82:4 85:9 110:12 144:6 192:4 individual's 207:17 208:8,25 indoor 78:13 127:11 127:12,14,17 128:22,23 industrial 8:13 10:11 11:1,2 29:12 30:11 30:12,15 40:25 41:3 41:6 42:12 60:16 61:5,6,10,11,24 62:2,4,7,11,13,18 62:21,25 68:6 72:2 72:9 90:21,23 96:4 96:12 100:11 107:14,17 108:21	109:3 113:6,12,16 113:17 117:15,20 118:24 120:17 121:4 122:7,9,12,21 131:18 133:21 134:23 135:20 143:16 industry 68:4,11,17 inferred 128:23 inform 22:20 48:24 53:23 54:13,17,21 54:22 55:14,20,21 56:2,6,17 105:6 129:2 information 7:10 29:12,14 42:15 47:5 52:3 61:14,17,21 62:1 65:10,11 81:17 88:21 96:24 97:6,8 132:4 136:4 191:22 informed 43:19 44:25 56:21 58:10 73:22,25 84:16 102:2 105:5 110:11 informing 72:15 97:9 97:13 99:20 100:2 informs 23:3,4,10 24:6 32:5 56:12 59:3 87:24 93:1 127:4,16 inhalant 110:1 inhibit 9:19 initial 19:24 20:24 125:3 137:11 167:15 initially 73:13 injury 7:14 68:10 75:19 86:24 inside 90:24 167:25 199:4 insofar 134:5 instance 147:19 instances 149:1 Institute 131:4 instrument 13:14 insulation 14:21 15:1 15:2,2,3 17:16,24	18:8,10 121:24 126:11 159:3,3,13 160:16,20 161:1 162:3 insurance 63:4,7,9,14 63:19,23 68:11,17 intend 42:8 51:2 59:13 64:9 65:2,5 65:20 87:20 88:14 89:7 130:13 192:3 193:3 209:14,22 210:2 212:23 intended 26:16 194:4 intensity 161:12 interest 73:19 74:4 86:10 interested 69:15 113:15 186:17 interfere 33:16 92:6 intermittently 151:17 International 74:14 interpretation 152:16 interrupt 53:10 114:7 116:16 intersection 164:19 184:21 213:19 interstitial 37:16,20 37:22 38:6 introduce 6:24 8:5 inversions 91:16 involve 91:5 198:24 involved 14:15 17:10 17:11 20:6 44:3 47:11,17 56:17 80:12 82:14,15 86:23 90:25 120:13 120:22 121:22 147:21 157:6 involving 13:10 16:17 36:17 68:8 76:14 86:24 97:14 155:6 in-house 17:11 in-town 145:22 irrespective 203:20
I			
idea 29:25 144:6 192:14 identification 66:3 67:4 74:24 77:5 78:1 87:12 131:11 identified 38:19 43:7 83:13 127:4 156:6 196:5 identifies 174:22 identify 38:3 41:19 44:2 54:7 88:13 180:23 182:7 188:22 identifying 150:1 II 140:24 141:24,24 142:15 III 141:23 144:10,23 illness 68:10 illustrates 160:7 ill-advised 190:18 imagine 183:14 impact 23:24 24:2 47:21 55:1 138:17 151:19 152:17,17 152:22 184:9 201:16 impacts 23:18 46:8 impinger 140:18 implies 48:12 imply 30:14 importance 202:19 important 31:7 46:2 57:11 60:16 61:15 97:1 200:15 202:22 imprecision 147:22 impression 49:13 improper 27:3 48:15 49:1,16 58:18,19 99:24 100:21			

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

irresponsibility 98:8 irresponsible 99:12 irresponsibly 98:1,5 issue 47:20 69:5 110:24 118:15 125:11 146:10 151:12 issued 19:7 211:18 issues 9:7 28:5 29:7 30:15,19 43:1 50:25 51:2 63:4,19 64:10 68:6 98:23 item 17:20 127:4 IV 144:9	keep 9:10,15 48:16 72:6 84:16 99:12 205:16 keeping 73:13 Kelly 77:10 Key 153:11 kicked 17:21 kicking 15:25 16:4 195:4 kilometers 197:18 213:25 kind 18:15 24:16,21 29:9 32:6 40:23 44:15 57:5,12 74:15 88:12,13,15 96:18 117:10 136:14 159:22 166:16 168:18 177:22 184:2 190:13,25 203:21 205:21 Kirkland 2:6 7:1 knew 83:19 86:19,21 86:23 87:1 101:14 101:24 109:5 199:19 206:22 207:1 know 8:20 9:7,25 13:15 14:3 22:5 23:10 26:16 30:25 33:14,18 34:20 40:18 42:10,10,22 42:23 43:2 44:4,8 44:12 46:11 47:12 47:22 49:11 50:23 53:15 54:5,24 56:9 56:19 57:7,9 63:8 63:10,14 65:17,23 69:21 70:14 73:21 78:14 83:21 84:1 86:18,21 87:3 89:18 91:4,6,8,9,19 92:23 93:18,19 95:9,19,20 97:18 98:10 99:11 99:15,21 100:3,9 101:2 102:24 105:3 107:13 109:9 114:3 116:6 120:18,21,23	126:2,9 127:20 128:4 130:22 132:4 133:7,23 134:22 137:23 139:17 144:3,20 145:8 146:17 148:22 150:14 152:15,24 154:18 158:22 159:1,1 161:14 162:10 166:16 168:9,10 169:15,18 171:3,5,10 174:8 178:2,5,9 179:3,23 183:8,20 184:2,4,13 184:15 185:25 186:12 187:13,25 188:18,22 191:14 192:18 193:13 194:17 195:18,20 199:20 200:15 202:2,23 203:10 204:25 205:12,15 206:17,25 211:14 211:17,20,24 212:2 212:10,12,13,16,17 212:20,22 213:15 knowing 49:14 166:2 knowingly 108:18 109:2,4,5,8 knowledge 28:3 39:8 105:4,5,7,24,25 106:3 108:7,9 109:15,23 112:22 125:15 128:14 182:9 known 96:19 98:16 99:19 100:4 109:18 110:1 114:20 knows 96:22 99:20 Koocanusa 26:5 185:9 Kootenai 213:17 Kovacich 2:14 Kris 69:11,12 76:19 79:3,6,9,11 84:13 109:7	<hr/> L <hr/> L 2:12 6:7 215:5,21 216:4 lab 111:18 173:7 176:10 179:7 lack 64:15 72:15,19 72:21 150:10,19 lacking 72:14 Lake 26:5 185:9 language 189:2 larch 166:9 large 102:20 142:24 143:1 147:17 192:9 larger 171:3 183:11 late 11:14 31:7 70:25 205:8 laterally 115:4 law 2:5,13,22 3:6,7 3:16 4:6,15 7:11 81:20,20 215:11 lawns 162:6 lawsuits 75:19 lawyer 42:23 49:17 lay 183:2 lead 35:24 83:1 126:13 leaks 162:16,18,19 163:7 learn 99:22 156:23 learning 113:15 leave 11:13 leaves 50:4 leaving 72:6 led 40:23 left 196:22 199:8 left-hand 165:15 legal 116:14 length 133:13,19 134:2,25 136:18,19 136:23 173:9,14 203:10,14,15,15,16 203:20 let's 12:5,9 14:11,12 17:6 23:23,24 26:2 27:11 28:18,18 32:6 34:13 36:2 37:12,13 38:12 40:13 47:8
---	---	--	--

J

Jackson 200:13
James 75:6 78:7
Jankovic 131:17
Jeffrey 4:14 7:18
JFK 6:17
Jim 177:19
JKF 1:7
job 61:9 93:18 117:6
 122:13 151:14,17
 151:22 152:12,14
 191:1,2 194:1,18
jobs 19:18
John 4:24 6:23
John's 58:2,2 169:15
Jointly 1:8
journal 30:11,13
 60:2 74:14 85:14,16
 86:5 131:18
journals 81:2,5,9,17
 85:15 170:6
Julie 75:3 77:9 78:6
 84:11 86:13
July 1:24 6:2,19
 214:23 216:2
June 5:17 67:7
jurisdiction 145:23
 146:4

K

Kate 7:13
KATHLEEN 3:15

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

64:17 66:16,24 83:2	17:6 19:4 22:15,21	162:14,20 163:3,6	92:21 93:13 96:5,7
88:2 89:21 94:18	22:22 23:10,11,19	163:14,18,19 164:2	96:12 100:3,12
96:3 104:6 124:5,6	23:25 24:7 27:9,14	165:19 168:22	112:12 113:5,7,13
124:23 129:21	33:4,6 34:2,10,11	169:15 170:8,10	113:17,18 119:5
135:13 137:12	34:18 35:13,15,18	176:23 178:11	120:5 134:24 149:6
158:24 169:15	35:22 36:19,21,25	180:4 188:4,13,16	154:18 155:4
173:18 200:16	37:3,9,20 38:5,14	189:4 190:14 192:9	litigation 68:10
204:10	38:15,16 39:9,14,22	196:1,4 197:16	little 19:21 75:10
level 46:4 61:15	40:5,9,11,16,22	198:12,13 209:2	100:25 115:20
83:23 84:1,1,2	41:2,8,13,16,24	210:3	116:4,15 153:16
118:17 129:16,17	42:3,13 43:3,8,20	liberate 83:20	156:14 163:5
134:16,16 136:9,9	45:1,3 46:9 47:1,3	liberated 83:22,23	183:15
137:20 176:6	47:11,18 48:9 50:1	lies 90:7	live 88:20 198:7,8
178:19 181:7	50:11,25 51:19	likelihood 37:9 38:5	LLC 4:7
185:20 191:9,11,11	53:24 54:2,15,18,22	limit 145:15 198:21	LLP 2:6 3:17 4:16
199:23	55:2,15,23 56:3,7	limitations 150:24	LO 152:13
levels 30:19 45:7,12	56:13,18 57:1 58:10	154:13,24	load 16:25 124:2
47:24 59:22 60:5,18	58:23 59:1,4 64:13	limited 120:21 206:7	loading 16:7,14,16,18
61:2,12 62:22 83:4	64:18,25 65:6,16	207:10	16:19,20 17:1,23
115:6 118:4 120:22	70:20,23 71:24	limiting 110:23 111:5	locales 188:9
121:1,1 126:20	72:16 73:20 75:2	111:7	located 103:2 169:12
134:18 136:17,22	76:1,10 77:8 78:5	limits 145:11 176:9	169:13 182:1,22
199:19	79:15 81:6,25 82:4	Lincoln 21:2 169:21	213:16
Lewis 2:12,14 5:5 7:3	82:11,12,20 83:25	185:1 189:10 192:5	location 143:8,13,14
7:3 22:25 25:1	84:17,18,21 85:10	199:18 206:18	143:19,25 144:12
26:15,22 28:11	86:24 89:23 90:7,14	207:9,19 208:10	164:4,6,10,13,18,22
30:20 31:22 32:10	91:16,25 92:4,19	line 7:5,8 25:18,19,21	165:3,6,7,10 167:8
33:7,12 36:7 48:11	93:15 98:6 100:13	48:17 150:10	167:9 172:14,19
48:21 49:7,15,21	100:17,22 101:14	175:21 214:15	175:15,21 176:5,5
51:4 53:9 58:17	102:16 103:10,13	216:7	176:23 177:12,24
63:18 64:15 66:14	103:18,21 104:1	lines 16:17,18 102:25	178:10,16,22,22
85:11,13 87:9,13	106:10 108:11,20	166:17 167:13	179:17 180:3,11
92:10 97:16 99:23	109:21 111:13,14	187:3	197:13,21 213:8,12
101:5,7 110:19	112:2,13 114:15	list 17:20 68:16	213:22 214:11
111:1,4,13,15	117:18,22 118:4	126:23 193:12	locations 60:20
116:13,23 117:12	119:21 120:1,6,13	listed 85:18 95:9	103:21 143:20
123:14,24 129:20	120:25 122:19	118:12 128:21	144:3,7 167:7,15
138:20,25 139:6	123:9 124:16 125:1	literally 193:10	180:17 188:4 189:4
149:12 152:4 194:7	125:1,4,10,21	literature 27:16,18	197:17
194:10 197:10,12	129:10 130:7	27:19,25 28:2,10,25	Lockey 43:14,17
207:22 208:2,13,16	133:11 138:18	29:2,15,17 30:6	44:15,19 46:10
209:7,9 210:5,15,18	139:24 155:5,11,16	32:3,4 34:21 35:19	51:12 110:13
210:20 213:6,7	156:10,16,21,25	36:20 38:1,3,4	Lockey/Rohs 44:19
214:6,17	157:5 158:20	39:12 41:20 42:13	Lodge 4:16
liability 68:10 116:15	159:10,14,19,20	43:3,6,11 47:9	logging 192:5,9 200:5
Libby 2:11 5:20 7:3	160:8,12 161:16,18	50:13 60:2 61:3,5	200:13
14:17 15:6,10,10	161:19,25 162:12	83:8 92:3,12,14,16	logic 181:12

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

long 10:12 33:8 36:22 38:21 88:2 114:21 134:13,13 135:10 136:12 183:10 192:1 201:6	lost 74:2 lot 12:23 18:5 31:15 91:15 98:15 144:4 156:6 166:17 170:5 171:1 183:15	manner 9:9 92:4,7 manpower 186:25 manufacturing 157:23 map 163:18 185:8 211:11,14,18 212:4 212:10,14,24 213:9	50:6 54:5 63:8,12 65:1,2,8 71:7 72:5 78:17 83:18 91:4,7 91:16 92:6,16 94:9 95:8,19 97:18 98:10 99:2,6 109:4 116:17 117:3,4,8 120:21 121:21 122:11 128:8 134:11 146:17 148:22 149:12 154:3 160:3 161:14 163:23 169:13,14,24 172:4 173:22 177:19,22 179:5,22 181:13 182:4 183:8 184:1,3 184:11 186:24 189:15 191:4 195:19 197:24 198:5 201:21 202:3 202:15 203:4,12 204:3,3,9 212:2,4 212:12,19
longer 14:9 101:1 134:2,5,25 135:14 141:8 160:5 173:5	lots 202:23 loud 100:10 Lovick's 101:3	March 115:17 mark 65:24,25 74:21 77:2 87:7 129:14	128:8 134:11 146:17 148:22 149:12 154:3 160:3 161:14 163:23 169:13,14,24 172:4 173:22 177:19,22 179:5,22 181:13 182:4 183:8 184:1,3 184:11 186:24 189:15 191:4 195:19 197:24 198:5 201:21 202:3 202:15 203:4,12 204:3,3,9 212:2,4 212:12,19
look 14:11 29:7 30:18 44:8 47:14 87:4 94:18 104:6 122:8 122:14 123:1 126:3 128:22 132:13 134:12 144:17 147:25 150:8 171:14 183:4,5,9,10 183:13 184:1 191:15 200:16	low 39:13 119:22,22 lower 45:3,25 134:18 137:20 138:11 177:12 lowest 46:4 84:1 176:6,9 lumber 82:5 lunch 129:25 lung 35:2 36:4,17 37:2,5,7,9 40:19 50:20 54:11 101:25	marked 66:2,5 67:3,6 67:10 74:23 77:4,25 78:3,4 87:11 131:10 131:13 210:16 market 108:14 Maryland 4:12 7:16 7:18 Marysville 44:17 45:7,12 47:2 158:7	128:8 134:11 146:17 148:22 149:12 154:3 160:3 161:14 163:23 169:13,14,24 172:4 173:22 177:19,22 179:5,22 181:13 182:4 183:8 184:1,3 184:11 186:24 189:15 191:4 195:19 197:24 198:5 201:21 202:3 202:15 203:4,12 204:3,3,9 212:2,4 212:12,19
looked 29:22 30:4 45:19 52:23 55:7 57:10,18 92:11,16 92:21 93:12,13,16 132:16,20 133:18 143:9 158:22 165:24 171:3,5,13 175:7 196:4 209:18	L-A-W 7:12	master's 10:25 67:19 material 39:14 72:22 109:5 114:5 115:10 117:5 119:10 120:2 120:3 126:13 162:14 177:9,9 193:21	128:8 134:11 146:17 148:22 149:12 154:3 160:3 161:14 163:23 169:13,14,24 172:4 173:22 177:19,22 179:5,22 181:13 182:4 183:8 184:1,3 184:11 186:24 189:15 191:4 195:19 197:24 198:5 201:21 202:3 202:15 203:4,12 204:3,3,9 212:2,4 212:12,19
looking 15:8 52:22 54:10 75:1 77:16 78:18,24,24 89:13 95:22 103:8 110:14 120:22 121:1 123:3 126:20 129:8 133:12 134:13 136:9 137:18 138:8 144:21,25 151:14 160:16 163:17 165:15 166:25 167:6 172:11,18,19 174:12 175:15 183:25 195:20 203:5 204:16 206:3 206:4 209:5 213:9	M	materials 14:18 29:7 72:6,16 89:19 91:1 113:14 115:15 118:2 128:7 matrix 148:2,5 149:9 149:22 matter 32:5 81:10 200:9 214:21 McDonald 110:12 154:20 McDonald's 155:3,8 McLean 69:11,12,25 70:7 71:19 72:25 73:8,16,22 76:20 79:3,6,9,12 84:14 109:8	128:8 134:11 146:17 148:22 149:12 154:3 160:3 161:14 163:23 169:13,14,24 172:4 173:22 177:19,22 179:5,22 181:13 182:4 183:8 184:1,3 184:11 186:24 189:15 191:4 195:19 197:24 198:5 201:21 202:3 202:15 203:4,12 204:3,3,9 212:2,4 212:12,19
looks 92:17 102:15 172:11 loose 117:10 120:4 loosely 184:13 LOs 151:4	machine 215:13 machines 15:23 madam 65:25 77:3 139:9 magnification 183:12 204:13 main 12:3 72:23 79:21 maintenance 24:17 25:10 major 208:14 majority 39:9 making 62:15 99:11 154:12 196:18 male 33:23 man 48:20 manager 103:11 mandated 118:17 manifest 35:12 manifestation 50:11 manifested 40:15 manifesting 41:22	mean 12:25 13:12 26:24 27:2,19 28:14 28:17 30:3,23,24 31:2,14 32:4 33:14 33:22 42:11 43:22	128:8 134:11 146:17 148:22 149:12 154:3 160:3 161:14 163:23 169:13,14,24 172:4 173:22 177:19,22 179:5,22 181:13 182:4 183:8 184:1,3 184:11 186:24 189:15 191:4 195:19 197:24 198:5 201:21 202:3 202:15 203:4,12 204:3,3,9 212:2,4 212:12,19

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

203:19 measuring 149:22 media 122:22,25 125:7 174:4,5,15,15 190:5 206:22 medical 31:23 32:2,3 32:13 34:21 35:19 36:19 37:23,24 38:1 38:3 40:18 41:5 42:11,13 43:2,6 50:13,21,24 51:18 51:25 58:14 60:2 61:19,20,25 62:19 64:3 99:8 104:9 109:12 111:9 112:17 113:5,12 209:19,20,22 medication 9:18 medicine 31:19 32:18 58:6,7 96:12 113:18 131:18 Meeker 39:23 40:1 110:24 111:22 171:2 meet 69:24 72:24 73:7 meeting 69:22,25 70:7 73:1 Mellott 4:7 members 100:14,22 102:4 108:19,19 membrane 140:20 144:11 memoranda 128:3,7 128:11,17,22 memorandum 126:4 126:6 127:6 memorandums 127:25 memory 76:11 memos 63:13 men 101:16 mention 55:5 96:10 106:25 mentioned 14:2 19:15 25:8 32:12 41:8,12,15 43:18	51:12 56:20 58:16 74:3 93:8 98:25 113:6 155:20 166:13 200:4 merely 174:22 MESA 140:21,22 141:8,11,19 142:4 mesothelioma 34:25 36:4,17,23 37:1,12 55:12 met 130:24,25 meter 115:12 meters 115:7 method 18:19 134:15 140:1 143:21,22 148:18 149:23 150:3 166:16,18 171:25 176:11 178:3 199:21 methods 30:19 Meyer 78:7 microbiology 10:20 67:17 micrograph 183:11 micrometers 133:13 133:15,17,22 134:6 173:8 205:18 microns 133:15,19 134:2,25 135:3,14 138:16 139:22 140:5 173:1,5,14,20 203:13,16 204:4 206:2 Microns/micromet... 133:16 microscope 183:14 205:20 microscopy 171:11 mid 76:3,8 middle 110:4 150:9 178:11 midget 140:18 mile 214:3 miles 164:15,16 186:1,23 mill 70:20 95:16 101:16 102:20	103:1 140:17,19 144:18,25 146:2,7 147:10,12 Millers 131:15 milliliter 202:6 millimeter 177:7 milling 71:23 89:16 94:22 98:6 155:11 155:17 156:11,17 170:23 171:19 172:1 181:9 196:15 million 103:16 147:4 148:15 172:16,22 175:23 176:1,19,24 177:1,24 178:11,12 178:16 179:16,19 mind 28:2 43:22 46:11 82:3 97:2 101:21 102:9 103:3 205:16 mine 15:9,24 16:5,21 17:21,22 18:17 19:18 26:3,4,5 44:9 70:20 75:20 84:11 95:16 117:23 125:1 133:10,10 140:17 141:12,22 145:20 145:21 146:3 155:6 163:21 164:5,7,8,11 164:13 165:19 166:6,10,18,20 167:15 169:9 170:17 171:20,21 171:22,23 180:12 180:16 185:9,11,18 185:21 186:2,7,14 186:21,23 187:4,12 188:17 206:13,14 206:17,20 213:1,13 214:11 mineral 39:1,7 170:1 170:2 mineralogical 109:21 170:8 mineralogist 38:25 39:3 112:7 mineralogy 40:3	112:13 170:5 Miners 5:22 131:15 mines 188:21 mining 68:4 71:23 89:16 94:22 98:5 155:11,16 156:11 156:16,25 170:9,23 172:1 181:9 196:1 196:15 mining/milling 175:5 Minnesota 11:1,3,5 11:11,14,16 67:23 minutes 141:1 196:22 198:25,25 misinterpret 27:12 misleading 139:2 misnomer 168:18 Mississippi 34:14 50:16 Missoula 10:22 69:13 misstate 41:14 misstates 110:21 123:15 mistaken 152:1 172:12 misunderstood 13:9 mix 40:6 mixed 46:11 204:15 204:17 mixture 38:16 moment 124:6 136:12 138:8 200:16 Monokote 159:1 Monokote-3 159:4,9 Montana 1:23 2:16 6:2,8,21 8:15,15 10:3,4,13,21 11:8 11:11,16,19 13:23 14:2 19:1,7,11 33:4 33:6 34:18 40:11 73:2 75:2 77:8 109:25 122:15 140:19 142:11 143:3 197:16 198:13 215:1,7,23 215:23
---	--	---	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

morbidity 47:13 131:14 132:11,14 137:23 139:23 Morbidity/Mortality 5:22 MORGAN 4:23 morning 8:3,4 26:9 26:12 27:6 mortality 31:8,16 43:25 44:8,9 47:14 60:15 62:22 131:14 132:10,20,20 135:24,24 136:5,10 137:3,25 138:3,12 139:22 mountain 90:7 181:14,21,25 move 49:15 88:20 91:1 94:9 115:4,8 130:5 144:4 152:18 153:7 167:12 186:21 187:23 190:16 193:20 moved 152:2 169:25 movement 15:23 mover 194:3 moving 91:3,4 101:24 144:6 146:9 167:5 186:14 187:22 mppcf 103:15 142:9 146:10 147:16 148:2,11,21,24 149:3,10,21,23 mppcf's 149:16 MSHA 140:21,22 141:18,21 142:4 145:7,9,17,19,22 MSHA's 146:4,7 Myron 75:6 M-E-S-A 141:8	named 215:12 narrow 23:22 83:2 91:2 narrower 23:22 National 29:12 131:4 natural 108:10 169:6 naturally 168:15,19 169:2,7,11,16,20 170:11,24 172:2 175:3 181:10,11 196:2,10,12,13 nature 49:8 161:4 193:4 near 167:22 188:6,21 189:17 197:15,16 198:13 199:12 nearby 200:13 necessarily 96:17 102:21 111:11 143:19 152:21 necessary 81:16 need 26:6 66:14 132:4 144:20 153:12 164:25 173:19 needed 115:11 needles 184:13 Needless 178:21 needs 49:17,17 negative 168:3 208:12 neighborhoods 159:25 Nemours 4:17 net 152:17 never 58:5 79:11 82:14 130:24,25 149:14 new 67:12 144:18,25 175:18 176:20 177:2 188:20 nineteen 197:11 NIOSH 29:11 43:25 106:10,17,20 118:14 120:1 131:1 131:4 138:16 139:14,21 140:21	140:22 142:7 nodding 9:9 182:17 non 205:12 non-malignant 35:5 36:5,13 Noonan 75:4 Nordhagen 1:21 4:24 6:7,20,22,23 215:5 215:21 216:4 normally 41:23 north 4:18 164:4,10 northeast 26:3 164:1 200:14 notarial 215:18,24 Notary 6:8 215:6,22 noted 6:7 notice 6:4 noticed 176:4 notified 71:8 notify 79:13 November 125:22 nowadays 143:17 148:10 number 8:21 30:3 53:14,16,22 87:9 128:2 138:10 142:24 143:1 145:14 151:8,14 171:3,7 172:25 178:4 187:16 201:5 201:6 206:6,7,8 207:10 numbered 88:6 numbers 22:11 147:17 numerous 158:11 NW 2:7,24 N.W 3:19 4:8	36:7 48:25,25 49:3 49:5,8,12 51:4 58:17 64:15 85:11 99:23 101:5 110:19 111:15 objections 23:7 48:17 49:19 64:13,16,18 64:21 observation 182:20 observing 94:12 obstruct 106:12,12 obtained 103:21 211:8 obtaining 32:21 obviously 23:12 31:5 34:7 40:21 71:10 93:16 97:5 110:20 114:14 122:13 154:3,4 185:25 202:22 occasions 56:20 occupational 19:17 20:11 23:14,22 31:5 58:7 77:14 96:11 113:18 131:5 191:8 occur 70:2 77:17 78:12 161:25 163:2 191:1 199:17,22 occurred 60:20 153:24 158:16 159:20 162:12,16 163:2 164:18 170:10 188:15 195:14 199:4 occurring 16:20 41:22 84:21 168:15 168:19 169:2,7,11 169:16,20 170:24 172:2 174:20 175:3 181:10,12 196:2,11 196:12,14 207:8 occurs 42:4 47:20 50:25 54:14 55:22 181:13 offer 42:9,11 51:2 61:10 63:19 64:9 65:2,5,20 85:22
--	--	---	---

N

n 5:1 201:3
name 8:7,8 38:21
88:19 92:13 141:9
166:7

O

object 22:25 28:11
33:12 48:11 49:1
53:9 58:19 97:16
111:4 123:14 124:4
138:20 152:4,6
objection 25:1 26:25
30:20 31:22 32:10

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

86:5 87:20,25 88:14 89:7 130:13,16 174:9 192:3 193:3 207:17 208:8,19,23 208:24 209:14,22 210:2,10 offered 72:1 213:2 offering 64:12 84:20 208:3 Off-the-record 67:14 oh 11:23 13:8 15:3 17:13 47:6 53:6 66:11,25 74:3 79:11 91:18 101:8 110:6 145:2 150:18 160:15 181:3 194:12 200:9 Ohio 44:17 47:2 158:7 okay 7:6 8:14 9:3,18 9:22 10:3,12,18,24 11:7 12:2,9 13:3,22 14:11 15:6,19 16:3 16:8,12 17:1,5,13 17:19 18:3,15,20,23 19:19,23 20:1,5,5 20:16 21:4,12,15,22 22:17,20,23 23:3 24:11 25:12,14,17 27:11,21,25 28:16 28:22,24 29:19,24 30:5 31:4,18 32:6 32:15 33:12,25 36:2 36:13,24 37:12,19 38:2,9,12 39:4,9,16 39:21 40:5,5,9,13 40:23 41:7 42:8,16 43:11,24 44:5,13,13 44:19 45:10 46:21 46:24 47:13 48:5 50:4,22 51:10,22 52:14,18 53:23 54:4 54:13,17 55:1,5,20 56:1,16,20 57:5,11 57:15,20,23,23 58:1 58:5,9,13 59:6,13 59:16 61:1,10 62:7	62:25 63:3,21,25 64:3,12,24 65:5,19 66:9,23,25 67:25 68:15 69:17,24 70:4 70:6,22 71:4,10,22 72:13,24 73:7,10,15 74:12 75:6,9,14,22 76:5,12,18 77:2,16 77:22 78:4,11,18,23 79:2,5,19 80:5,9,14 81:5,16 82:2,7,10 82:16,19 83:2,7,12 83:23 84:4,10,18 85:1,7,13,21,25 86:4,9,15,19 87:4 87:19,23 88:2,5,5 88:12,19 89:3,10,13 89:21 90:1,3,13,16 90:21 91:3,12,21,23 92:3,10,24 93:8,13 93:23 94:1,3,15,18 95:1,5,15,21,21 96:3,17 97:7,23 99:2,5,11 100:8,20 100:25 101:13,24 102:15 103:3,7 104:6,13,16 105:5 105:11,18 106:5,25 107:3,6,10,16,21,24 108:8,13,16 109:10 109:10,20 110:6,16 111:15,22 112:6,15 112:21 113:9,21,24 114:14,19 116:5,5,9 116:9,12,22 117:9 117:21 118:3,24 119:12,15,23 120:9 120:12,19 121:7,12 121:18 122:7,16 124:5,20,23 125:8 125:18,24 126:17 126:23 127:3,8,21 128:6,13,21 129:2 129:15,19 130:5,17 130:20,24 131:13 131:21,24 132:7,13 132:16 133:5,17	134:4,22 135:2,7,12 135:18,23 136:8 137:10 138:7,14 140:4,11,13 141:8 141:23 142:16,23 143:2,7,10,12,22,25 144:5,9,17 145:2 146:2,6,9 147:1,6 147:15,25 148:20 149:19 150:3,6,8,23 151:25 152:7,13,17 152:21 153:7,22 154:17 155:2,19 156:2,5 157:2,5,8 157:17 158:1,4,10 158:19 159:4,12,16 160:6,18 162:4 163:5,16 164:4,8,10 164:22 165:9,14 166:12,23 167:2,5 168:14 169:19,23 171:18 172:8,11 173:3,13,16 174:6 175:2,12,15 177:8 178:10,10 179:25 180:3,17,22 182:3 185:15,22 187:5,13 187:21 189:9,17,20 190:6,13,16 191:13 191:16 192:3,14,20 193:3,6,9 194:19 195:12,24,24 196:5 196:10,18,21 197:8 198:2,10,16 199:3,7 199:15,21,25 200:4 200:17,21 201:6,16 202:9,18 203:4,11 204:1,14,19 205:14 207:6,15,21 209:4 209:17,25 210:13 210:15,20 211:10 212:15,18 213:5,11 213:15,19 214:1,5 214:14,20 old 67:2,2,11,12 205:7 once 7:20 73:9	101:13 107:21 112:15 113:21 130:10 154:12 194:19 200:5 214:18 ones 12:3 43:21 112:16 125:19,25 129:9 171:13,13,15 186:17 one's 100:25 ongoing 15:12,15 30:9 71:2,5 123:8 124:24 126:13 onset 44:5 48:9 49:25 on-site 68:7 open 98:23 165:8 operable 162:24 operating 89:23 95:17 operation 70:19 71:23 72:3 98:6 114:15,16 143:25 144:12 155:12,17 156:11,17,25 157:5 158:2 165:20 168:23 170:9,24 171:19 172:2 175:5 192:10 196:2,15 201:22 operations 89:19 102:16 103:12 117:22 143:8,13,14 159:17 192:9 operator 200:25 202:9 205:25 206:5 206:6 207:18 208:9 opine 42:24,25 59:14 59:20 opinion 22:21 24:6 33:2 35:11,17,20,21 36:3,4,5,16,24 37:1 37:2,8,11,19,25,25 38:4,9 40:14,21 42:17,18,19,20 43:6 43:8,12 45:1 47:17 47:21 48:9 49:25 51:8 54:14,18,22
--	--	--	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

55:2,20,22 56:6,17 59:22,25 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:6,16,22 64:3,21,24 65:1,3,5 65:10 71:19 72:5,8 82:3,20,23 83:12 84:23 87:19 90:13 91:14 93:1 94:5 98:4,14 109:7 119:15,19,20,24 127:4,16 128:17 129:3 133:9,12,21 134:21 169:1,4,5,19 174:9,20 184:9 187:9 189:21 193:3 202:18,21 207:17 208:8 213:2 opinions 20:17 23:1,3 23:3,4 37:13 40:24 41:1,2,7 42:8 43:19 51:2,7 53:24 55:15 56:22 58:10,14,22 59:3,6,10 60:18 61:10 64:9,12 72:1 81:23 83:4 85:22 86:6 87:20,25 88:14 89:7 98:15 112:11 125:9 130:14,16 133:6 156:9,12,13 156:19,23 192:4 210:2,11 opportunity 46:25 opposed 9:9 33:5 35:13 37:3,10 38:6 110:17 166:4 170:10,24 172:2 175:4 176:5 177:13 181:10 195:15 196:2 Orange 4:18 order 132:3 136:6 156:15 173:18,20 ore 39:14 157:6 162:13 origin 114:22 originally 70:11 192:8 196:14	Orr 3:15 7:13,13 Orrick 3:17 OSHA 29:10 145:9 145:17,18,20,23 OSHA's 134:15 Outdoor 90:16 outlier 134:4 150:6 outside 26:4 33:6 34:2 35:15 41:24 91:1,3 133:10 159:20 160:4,7,8,12 163:3,6,19 166:6 189:10 oven 78:13 overall 151:6 overbroad 33:17 owned 157:17 158:2 O.M 44:17 157:22 <hr/> P page 5:2,15 10:1 68:2 99:17 101:10,11 129:7 136:16 140:14 141:24 144:9 146:9 147:25 150:9 153:7 163:17 163:18,23,23 165:14,14 167:5,5 167:13 182:18 187:22,22,24 197:9 198:10 199:7 200:20 213:10 216:7 pages 88:3 215:15 paid 64:25 71:13 81:19 84:5,8 pain 44:3 46:22 47:10 painful 41:24 42:5 51:1 54:19 56:3 paper 20:14 51:17 52:15,16,19 53:23 53:25 54:13,17,21 55:6,6,11,14,14,18 55:21,25 56:1,5,10 56:12,16 73:20 77:16,23 78:23 79:2	79:5,9,19 80:5,20 80:21,21,25 81:1,2 81:13 82:2,3 84:4 86:1,2,7 89:4,8 92:22 127:2 130:18 131:2,24 132:7,25 133:2,6,7,18 134:4 140:6,14 142:1 144:1 155:20,25,25 156:2,3 163:16,24 167:2 168:8 171:23 171:24 175:6 185:3 185:17,18 186:18 187:15,18 193:8,14 200:4 205:24 206:10 207:8 209:12 papers 19:20 55:16 74:6,9 80:22 86:11 86:13 132:13,14,24 133:2 155:3,9,14 170:12 182:13,14 185:5 paragraph 88:19,25 89:1,13,13,22 90:6 94:18,19,19 95:5 96:3,4 99:18 100:8 100:9,9,25 101:10 101:15,24 102:15 102:17 103:7 104:3 104:6,7,13,16,19,22 104:25 105:18,25 106:5,8 107:3,6,6 107:10,21,24 108:2 108:3,16 109:10,11 109:20,20 110:3,5 110:16,20 111:9,23 112:15,16,21,25 113:4,9,24,24 114:6 114:19 116:5,9,25 117:14,15,21 118:3 126:4,7 129:8 130:5 150:10 151:3,25 152:8 165:15 182:18 199:8 paragraphs 88:6,8 88:14,16,21,22	94:20 95:2 paraphrase 124:2 152:5 paraphrasing 41:13 Pardon 13:5 part 10:16 13:25 19:8 19:9 24:20 48:3 60:7,8,11,19,21,21 61:9 62:15 72:4,23 73:14 83:7,9 84:23 85:22 93:4,5 94:7 94:24 97:1,10,14 103:3 105:16 109:24 117:24 121:4 126:19 131:7 131:15 157:5 166:12,13,15,20,21 168:8,23 191:18 196:15 199:2 partially 198:6 participating 69:16 participation 68:9 particle 12:1 particles 103:16 147:5 148:16 particular 12:19 13:24 44:6 85:25 93:6 100:4 175:6 183:20 185:3 192:2 201:22 particularly 83:25 107:17 144:2 146:15 163:1 168:21,22 particulate 91:24 particulates 92:19 parts 60:9 140:13 207:3 Pascagoula 34:13 Pass 210:14 passage 115:9 pathway 17:3,5 54:7 pathways 14:16 15:6 15:7 16:3 17:25 18:3 52:4 81:19,22 patient 32:22 patients 32:25 41:21
---	---	---	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

47:1 58:11 60:12 Patricia 43:13 Patty's 29:12 Paul 125:3,21 211:2 pause 23:14 70:16 81:12 86:14 103:2 114:13 119:8 128:2 170:6 178:7 182:5 200:15 210:22 paying 71:15 PBZ 21:10 200:22 PC 2:14 PCM 133:12 176:12 202:3 204:6,7,12 204:18,19 205:2,10 205:15,17 PD 3:3 peak 170:16 peaks 171:12,16,18 172:4 175:8 pediatrician 57:21 pediatrics 58:3 peer-reviewed 140:8 142:16,19 156:3 Peipens 43:14,17 51:13,17 52:15,19 53:4,23,25 54:17,21 PEL 145:7,9,17,17 145:18 146:6,7 147:10,21 penalty 216:22 pending 33:10 124:7 Pennsylvania 4:8 people 16:4 24:13 34:7,10,13 40:15 46:13,14 47:2 53:2 53:7,17 62:5 80:1 94:21 95:22 102:10 109:6,8 114:5 135:25 138:4 160:7 161:7,17,19 162:6 163:6 165:3 180:18 187:2 189:11 193:17,20 194:23 195:17 percent 39:13,18 46:15,15,17 52:19	52:25 54:8 95:6,25 118:15,19,21 125:11 171:16 percentage 46:12 54:8 118:21 percentages 52:22 95:9,19 118:1 119:22 perform 25:6 193:24 performed 18:24 27:15,16 103:20 110:8,11 190:4 performing 27:9 period 31:20 101:21 127:10,11 148:13 198:21,24 199:1 periods 140:25 153:13 perjury 216:22 permission 164:24,25 Peronard 125:3,21 126:20 211:2 person 35:13,14 37:3 37:4 52:1 57:12 69:9 135:10,15 137:24 152:25 159:9,12 165:10 177:20 190:1 193:18 201:18,22 personal 7:13 21:6,9 21:12,15,22 68:9 72:20 75:19 83:21 86:24 119:7 140:25 195:8,12 200:22 personally 92:2 121:18 134:8,10 person's 65:12 pertain 104:19 pertained 70:14,15 pertaining 13:18 14:8,10,17 29:8 33:19 45:4 58:25 63:15 72:6 73:20 128:19 133:9 148:8 pertains 105:2 108:6 108:8,12 Perusing 104:18,21	104:24 105:2 107:5 107:8,12,23 108:1,6 112:20 117:24 philosophy 138:3 phone 69:17 73:11,12 Ph.D 1:17 5:3 6:1,5 7:22 11:2,4 67:22 215:10 216:1,25 PI 3:13 4:3 picture 163:18 pictures 183:5,6,7,9 piece 38:3 191:12 pilot 207:10 pine 175:18 177:2 184:13 pinpoint 43:22 place 3:8 6:6 49:13 72:10 92:8 103:11 141:7 215:12 plaintiff 76:1 plaintiffs 68:11,16 75:23 86:17 plan 106:20 planning 71:7 plant 61:14 90:24 91:1,4 105:8 159:25 160:4,8 161:4 213:16,23 planted 166:10 plants 60:14 157:16 157:17 158:4,12 plausible 168:3 please 8:5 9:25 27:13 28:8 41:18 65:25 66:1,11 74:22 77:3 87:8 89:15 97:12 103:14 106:9 108:5 124:8 130:6 139:8 153:7 210:6 pleura 35:9 pleural 37:16,18 38:10,12 40:13,15 41:2,8,12,16,22 42:3,4 43:8,20 44:3 44:5,11 45:1,14,24 46:4,8,15,15,18,22 47:11,18 48:9 50:1	52:20 53:20,24 54:14,18,22 55:2,15 55:19,22 56:2,6,18 58:10 59:4,8,10 plots 24:19 point 9:24 12:18 85:12 86:4 114:21 115:5,7 130:19 138:13,15 139:13 156:22 174:1 179:12 184:15 185:21 192:19,23 203:1 214:10 pointed 53:25 pointing 45:2 137:1 points 16:22 88:9,9 135:23 137:22 138:12 139:23 policies 63:7,9 pollutant 91:24 pollutants 90:9 94:3 pollution 102:3 pop 162:7 population 45:17 46:19 48:2 52:24 54:6 61:21 132:17 154:20 population-based 54:10 portion 110:2 portions 50:20 pose 83:24 position 193:19 195:1 possibility 188:3 possible 102:2 188:14 189:9,22 post 125:19,24 144:18 145:1 149:15 potassium 39:3 potent 36:23 potential 17:5 19:17 22:21 23:19 24:6 52:4 54:1 77:17 78:11,19,24 79:20 80:4 84:20 93:9 95:2 97:9,14 104:3
---	--	--	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

112:18 114:1 116:7 116:10 123:12 124:13 127:5 128:19 161:12,22 174:10 192:21 206:11 207:17 208:8,25 potentially 61:22 80:1,14 161:12 practice 48:23 113:16 134:3 143:15 pre 148:25 205:7 precision 153:13 predecessor 96:13 100:15 predict 200:1 predicted 201:11 predicting 199:21 predominant 39:22 preliminary 77:9 159:21,24 160:2 192:10,16,17 207:11 preparation 179:4 prepared 211:11 presence 174:22 present 4:22 48:13 182:8 205:3,11 presented 70:8 199:11 preserve 48:18 pressures 91:10 presumably 82:10 191:21 presume 9:23 pretty 88:2 155:23 178:20 206:7 prevalence 45:14 46:18 54:11 prevalent 12:21 preventing 61:7 80:17 previous 36:18 45:4 120:25 171:4 177:23 previously 75:23	81:6 85:9,23 120:13 120:20 pre-1969 147:3 primarily 11:24 14:25 15:1,8 90:23 140:19 145:20 primary 133:3 181:16 principles 100:11,13 117:15,20 prior 48:13,14 110:1 111:21 120:5 137:24 140:17 146:20 151:5 153:24 private 68:11,17 probably 8:23,25 22:10 26:2,3 28:21 29:3 54:16,25 66:14 91:7 127:24 164:15 170:13 198:25 210:21 213:3 problem 124:1 problems 93:20 148:14 procedure 48:18 64:1 procedures 76:21 proceeding 8:9 proceedings 6:10 70:9 210:22 process 9:3 160:10 173:6 194:24 processed 90:2 162:13 processing 165:20 188:7 produce 128:10 129:17 produced 20:20 128:11 175:9,12 182:15 product 14:23 63:23 products 158:20,21 158:24 159:2 professional 6:7 58:14 68:1 215:5 professor 10:7	program 12:13 51:19 68:4 99:8 104:9 167:16 progress 50:19 progresses 41:15 progressing 50:14 progression 41:25 50:9 56:9,13 progressive 35:23 41:15,25 42:5 50:5 50:7 51:1 54:23 56:7 project 121:22 projects 14:13 26:17 prolong 115:13 promised 53:9 pronoun 138:22 pronounce 38:21,22 propensity 119:4,16 120:6 129:3 proper 102:12 152:6 190:19 properties 114:4 property 7:9 164:8 proportion 152:12 proposed 106:10,22 proposing 192:8 protect 100:12,16 protecting 30:25 protection 11:25 12:7 12:10,13,16 13:1 14:3 21:8 115:1,16 protective 72:21 165:13 provide 31:10 62:5 65:10 68:3 71:17 provided 19:12 29:13 71:19 110:23 provides 61:21 97:8 108:10 providing 12:12 68:8 public 6:8 22:18 90:25 112:12 200:9 211:15 215:6,22 publication 43:14 71:9 73:18 75:15 86:2 212:19	publications 22:14 29:11 30:8,10,15 31:8 43:15,18,19,23 55:8 73:25 80:23 82:1 95:9 127:9 publicly 211:6 publish 27:10 79:14 168:6 published 19:20 20:3 20:7,14 22:14,16 23:12 44:20,22 51:15,18 55:9,11 70:25 71:8 73:20 75:2 77:13 78:7 81:14 85:8 88:22 89:4 92:22,23 100:5 113:12 118:10 125:25 126:1 131:17 149:6 155:4 155:9,22 156:3 163:24 168:8 pulmonary 31:18,24 32:18 35:23 36:12 37:13,14,14 42:1 46:13 48:1 52:11,14 55:17 57:16 58:6 pulmonologist 57:8,9 pump 152:25 pun 194:4 purport 185:16 purporting 187:14 purports 48:14 purpose 111:25 183:8 purposes 28:25 63:23 172:9 pursuant 6:4 put 15:3 23:23 44:15 53:16 86:12 87:10 89:10 92:17 99:7 103:4 164:8 207:13 212:20 putting 161:17 P.O 2:15 <hr/> Q <hr/> qualification 151:11
---	--	---	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

qualifications 32:8 50:23	quicker 41:22 42:4 47:20 48:3 50:25	50:13 52:8 58:24,25 63:12 68:1,2,13	receiving 86:5
qualified 31:23 42:25	quickly 41:17 48:7	75:7 77:11 90:6,11	recess 66:19 129:25 197:3
qualifies 43:3 59:19	54:15 55:22	93:20,21 100:10,10	recognize 131:22 199:10
quantification	quintiles 45:18	100:18 102:24	recognized 153:11
123:17 154:1	quite 8:20 91:2 102:4	103:8,9 106:8,9,14	recollection 50:2 211:19
quantifications	172:13 189:9,22	108:4,16,17,22	reconstruction
135:21	quote 127:25	110:19 111:25	140:10
quantify 134:18	quoted 68:2 100:10	112:4,19 113:9,19	record 6:13 8:6 9:10 9:16 26:23 48:19,22 49:16,22 66:18,22 91:8 106:8 108:17 112:1 113:10 124:9 129:24 130:3 139:10 163:23 187:15 197:2,6 200:10 208:4,18 214:24 215:15
quartile 45:25 46:5	108:17	114:19,23 115:18	records 61:19
quartiles 45:18	quotes 106:13	118:6 124:7,9 126:8	record's 202:2 206:9 207:7 209:17
question 9:24 14:1	quoting 101:2	126:9,15,25 127:1	recycle 94:9
23:8 25:4 26:19,24		128:19 131:19	recycled 90:10 94:4
26:25 27:3 28:8,11	R	133:7 139:8,10	reduced 203:1
30:21 32:1,11 33:8	R 77:10	141:3 150:13 151:9	reentrainment
33:8,10,13,16,19	radiographic 132:16	151:10 153:8,18	115:14
34:1 36:3,8,9,9 39:4	radiology 32:16 58:6	165:16,22 167:17	refer 16:16 17:14 213:7
42:22 45:11 48:11	rail 16:17,18 175:21	172:17 182:25	reference 89:3 110:6 111:16
48:14 49:1,6,9,21	176:23	187:25,25 188:10	referenced 126:4 140:9 211:5
49:24 51:5 54:25	railcars 163:7,11	192:18 197:19	references 88:4,5 209:19
58:19,20 63:14	railroad 162:16,17	198:14 199:9,13	referencing 125:20 126:3
95:19 97:19,19,21	162:19 163:1 188:2	208:4 216:5	referred 36:12 210:16 211:2
99:24 100:1 104:16	189:16,17	readers 52:8	referring 14:20 18:18 31:16 40:10 45:8 74:18 126:5 152:8 169:24 170:12 185:5
111:2 122:16 123:1	Rainey 164:19	readily 94:10 113:14	refers 27:1 50:8 112:21,25 113:4
123:15,18 124:7,11	184:21 197:15	reading 37:25 38:2	
126:2 129:14	213:20	41:20 43:2 50:12	
136:12 138:21,21	raise 27:13	61:5 110:4 118:3	
138:22,24,25 139:1	raises 188:2	125:16 150:15	
139:9,12,16 152:4,5	randomly 186:5	170:5	
152:6,6 153:23	range 9:1 22:6	real 20:1 41:18 51:11 205:18	
167:12 171:10	180:10	realized 168:2	
178:7 180:25 184:4	ranging 141:1	really 14:5 31:21	
185:3 186:13 208:1	rate 55:19 61:20	37:11 66:25 69:3	
208:6,20 211:13,16	71:15 85:4	71:5 78:20 98:15	
questionable 153:10	rates 31:16 54:6	151:15 177:4,8	
questioning 27:7	55:17 60:14,15	179:25 188:18,23	
124:3	61:13 137:23,24	reason 9:24 29:4	
questionnaire 51:23	ratio 148:1 153:14	134:13 142:17,20	
52:1,3	reach 62:1 156:23	143:12 148:15	
questions 9:7,19,23	184:11	158:10 179:16	
33:19,21 34:6 49:18	reached 23:2 192:23	205:21	
49:18 124:2 140:10	reaching 27:22	reasonable 149:10,23	
147:2 177:23 210:5	128:17 156:9,12,13	150:3 153:5 154:12	
210:21 214:7,17	156:23	recall 29:19,22 69:1,9	
quick 20:1 38:13	read 14:11 29:9,10	70:2,5 75:22 145:7	
41:18 51:11 193:12	29:17 32:3 33:7,10	145:8 168:12 211:2	
196:23 214:10	42:12 44:7 49:20,22		

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

183:5 reflect 87:19 95:15 reflected 141:2 reflects 141:25 refocus 124:6 regard 27:8 150:6 regarding 36:19,24 47:17 55:12 64:24 70:23 122:17 125:9 130:7 133:6 regardless 156:20 Registered 6:7 215:5 regulating 145:20 regulatory 68:6 relate 88:14,22 89:22 104:22,25 105:22 106:2,5 107:3,7,10 107:22,24 117:21 117:25 147:2 184:5 related 13:24 14:7,14 22:15 27:5,15 28:19 42:11 58:22 67:25 70:19 88:8 121:16 127:17 136:4 177:9 177:11 209:15 relates 14:3 36:4,5 88:25 89:1 90:13 105:19 107:8,13 108:24 117:15 118:1 126:7 174:17 relating 107:13 relationship 74:15 122:25 123:4,9 release 115:6 122:18 122:22 124:17 127:5 128:15,19 199:16,22 released 119:4,6,16 119:21 120:3,7 121:13,14,19 123:6 129:3,13 160:9 165:19 166:3 167:3 168:23 170:9 175:4 196:14 212:14 releases 76:14 120:9 123:12,18 124:13 127:17 169:8,8	189:23 200:1 relevant 57:13 81:23 82:1 107:18 132:8 151:11 reliability 134:17 reliable 123:11 124:12 143:22,23 143:23 reliably 129:16 179:13 reliance 128:7 relied 125:11,13,15 128:16,18 148:20 rely 40:1,3 84:25 125:8 185:2 212:23 213:4 remain 91:25 93:15 remained 93:14 remains 115:4 remediation 118:6 remember 22:10 28:22,23 30:3 45:19 52:17 53:22 55:24 56:10,14 69:6,7 70:15,18 72:4 73:3 76:2,3 84:15 120:25 170:4 REMEMBERED 6:4 removal 115:10 118:22 122:13 remove 21:20 repeat 45:11 46:1 51:9 207:25 repeatable 176:10 repetitive 210:6 rephrase 9:25 26:10 29:25 41:1 51:17 159:18 161:23 163:5 173:17 187:8 196:13 report 5:21 40:2 60:23 71:20,22 73:10 87:5,17,24 88:2,13 89:3,5 93:24 98:15 102:1 103:18 104:1 116:25 128:3,4	134:24 135:2 148:25 154:9 155:9 156:5 166:24,25 173:7 179:13 209:12,18 211:21 211:22,23,24 213:5 reported 47:7,23 95:23 103:10 171:24 172:6,7 175:9 179:19 182:12,14 187:1 205:5,9 215:13 reporter 6:8,22,25 9:15 33:7,11 49:22 65:25 77:3 124:9 139:9,10 140:22 208:4 215:6 216:4 reporting 1:21 6:20 139:24 reports 45:6,11,14 60:19 83:10 93:20 93:21,23 155:15 represent 8:8 199:12 representative 13:17 62:16 135:9 184:25 185:17 186:6,16 187:8,11,12 requires 24:15 146:14 requiring 118:6 research 14:8,12,13 14:13,15,17 17:10 17:11,12 18:23,25 19:3 26:8,9,11,17 26:17,17 27:1,2,5,8 27:14,16,18 74:14 79:14,17 81:18,21 82:23,24 84:4,5,12 85:23 121:22 156:20 researches 171:4 researching 29:1 reserve 214:6 reservoir 126:12 reservoirs 5:18 75:1 residency 58:6 residents 103:10	126:14 residing 215:23 resources 186:24 respect 32:8 37:1 38:10 39:4 80:25 85:25 98:5 100:21 112:12 125:24 154:25 163:1 192:6 respectively 202:13 respirable 115:12 respirators 12:14,15 respiratory 11:25 12:7,9,13,16 13:1 14:3 responding 9:8 response 106:11 122:17 responsible 97:2,10 97:15,24 99:7,9 145:20 rest 110:20 214:6 restate 111:1 123:25 123:25 restricted 26:4 165:1 184:20 restrictive 200:5 result 128:24 188:2 resulted 188:15 results 23:13,16,17 27:10 51:18 52:15 125:8 126:10 154:1 167:6 168:7,9 171:12 173:7 176:10 198:11 200:23 201:19 resume 57:10,19 196:24 retained 68:18,23 75:18 76:5 81:3,12 81:14 86:1 189:23 retention 81:10 revealed 182:20 review 28:9,19 30:8 34:21 35:18 43:6 52:16 58:15 60:2 61:2 83:8 86:9 113:6,17 120:5
--	--	--	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

reviewed 29:20 30:1 43:11 63:25 64:18 65:15,18 92:3 130:17 155:25 reviewing 27:19 reviews 27:25 28:2 Rich 3:5,7 7:8,8 richterite 38:20 39:5 39:6,25 112:2 riebeckite 38:21 right 9:6 11:20 12:5 21:13 26:3 44:10 46:17,17 47:4,15 52:10 53:3,18,19 65:11 72:8,18 74:16 80:17 88:3 90:16 93:24 100:6 102:19 103:1 105:9 106:22 111:6,20 117:7 121:9 122:6 123:8,9 124:22 125:1 128:1 141:10 145:10,12 145:19,25 146:19 148:10,12 149:2,8,9 150:18 153:2 154:6 154:8 155:7 156:22 158:16 160:17,18 160:23 161:10 162:8,21 163:22 164:6,23,25 165:2,4 165:7 167:13 168:1 168:20 169:16 170:4,7 171:23 174:1,3,16,18 177:17 178:8,9,18 179:10,15 180:9,21 181:23 182:6,15 184:6,8,15,20 185:12 187:13 188:25 190:10,10 191:25 194:22 195:21 196:18 202:1,4,7,8,17,24 203:3,23 204:7,22 206:9,15,15,24 207:5,10 209:8 212:1,6,10,20	214:18 risk 50:17 122:1 133:24 134:11,20 138:5 158:5 risks 102:3,7,10 112:18,19 river 162:15 170:4 213:17,20 road 15:23 163:21 164:12,15,20 184:21 186:1 197:15 200:13,13 206:14,17 213:20 213:25 roadways 186:14 ROHRHOFER 4:23 66:25 208:14 210:19 Rohs 43:14,16 44:13 44:14,15,22,25 45:9 45:11 46:10 47:10 47:13,21 48:8 49:25 51:12 role 14:5 57:2 61:6 61:11 62:3,4,13 63:1 room 204:11 root 167:24 168:4 rope 194:6 rough 183:15 roughly 54:8 Rules 48:17 runs 57:3,5 101:10 R-I-C-H 7:11 <hr/> S <hr/> S 2:21 5:14 safety 10:10 29:12 68:5 131:5 141:12 141:22 sample 164:23 166:3 168:7 172:14,18,19 176:14,15,19 177:6 177:25 178:25 179:4,14 184:10,17 185:17 186:6,9 187:10,11 188:2	198:11 201:7,13,14 202:3 203:4 204:3 sampled 165:4 samples 13:13,17 20:21,23 21:4 22:2 22:4,6,7,8,10 24:5,6 27:22,22 62:16 83:21 119:7 121:24 122:23 127:11,13 140:16,18,20,24 141:25 142:3,6,9,14 142:25 143:1 144:11 145:5 146:20 153:13,15 154:4 166:5,6 167:8 167:9,10,11,14,19 167:22,22,23 168:6 168:13 170:21 171:4,5,7,11,17,24 173:22,23,24,25 174:4,5 175:7 176:11 179:6,6,8,22 182:10 184:16,18 184:19,24,25 186:13,16 187:3,16 187:19 190:19,23 197:22 201:5,6,9,12 206:7,7 207:10 sampling 11:25 12:8 13:7,8,9,10,15 17:12 20:25 21:6,6 21:7,9,16,16,18,19 21:23,23 27:23 30:19 31:2 61:18 68:6 78:22 91:9 93:21 124:25 125:4 146:16 166:11,17 166:21 167:15,20 187:2,9 190:19 193:7 samplings 13:3 140:25 sanitation 31:1 70:15 70:17 72:21 76:21 saw 29:21 46:11,12 158:23 191:12 194:8,9,13,15,20	200:25 205:25 206:5,6,19 207:18 208:9 sawdust 202:25 sawed 193:20 sawing 191:2 192:12 193:10 209:1 saws 194:11 saying 9:10 17:14 36:20 37:24 42:12 47:4 61:19 82:23 92:7 152:11 171:8 186:20 188:13,18 188:23 189:1 191:10 204:24 says 94:3 142:15 151:3 192:17 scale 192:9 scans 182:10 scenario 206:10 scenarios 199:12 205:24 Schnetter 101:4 School 178:11 180:4 science 10:25 78:8 scientific 60:2 74:14 174:24 scientifically 140:7 Scott 44:17 157:22 screened 52:20,24 screening 51:16 58:12 213:15,16,23 seal 215:18,24 Seamans 4:7 searching 100:3 second 26:13 34:1 59:7 68:2 114:8 154:19 165:15 203:15 sections 156:6 see 26:2 45:24 74:19 88:2 103:18 110:21 110:24 147:25 150:10,22 166:24 167:6,7 171:6 177:7 178:5,6 180:10 183:9,12 184:17
---	--	---	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

185:8 198:21 204:12,16,17,19,24 205:17,19,20,21 206:20 209:18 seeing 41:21,25 45:3 47:25 48:6 58:11 60:14 61:13 94:8,11 147:20 seek 28:24 seeks 187:18 seen 35:25 59:9 60:11 64:16 65:22 82:18 148:5 159:2 161:14 182:9 200:11 seldom 148:7 select 186:5,6 SEM 182:20 send 73:19 84:13 101:16 179:6 sending 157:6 sense 123:16 136:13 201:24 204:18,25 sensitivities 179:11 sensitivity 134:14,17 176:5,6,8,13,16,19 176:22 177:12 178:1,16,19,22,24 179:7,11,17,21 sent 171:10 189:22 sentence 101:15 104:8 114:20 118:4 118:9,10 150:9 151:2 153:9 165:16 sentences 187:24 September 215:24 series 19:20 21:5 118:14 serious 103:25 serve 71:10 Service 19:16 20:8,11 20:17,25 21:24 22:13 23:13,21 24:9 24:11,14,14 25:5 166:8,22 200:10 212:3,5,13 services 71:13,17 set 215:17	settle 91:20 105:15 115:12 settled 16:9 105:9 121:3,3 122:10 settlement 64:25 settlements 65:3 settling 115:14 seven 184:18 197:10 197:11 severe 35:22 40:19 shared 109:7 shed 90:8 183:18 shlepped 194:14 short 134:12,21 135:10 194:3 shorten 49:17 shorter 133:22 137:12 138:16 139:14,22 140:5 173:4 206:2 shorthand 215:13 short-term 140:25 201:9 show 137:20 showed 95:6,25 showers 31:1 showing 61:20 97:17 163:21 shown 36:22 112:2 shut 166:10 side 200:14 siding 122:13,14 Signed 216:22 Significant 115:6 silicates 165:17 Silver 215:3,6 similar 70:16 112:16 143:18,20 188:6 199:17 207:8 similarly 112:21 116:9 159:12 186:4 195:24 simply 15:13 134:14 206:12 simulate 25:9 62:5 simulated 24:23 25:5 25:10,13,15,18	191:5 simulation 19:25 198:12 simulations 5:19 26:1 77:8 190:17 197:14 199:11 sir 26:23 42:6 48:20 68:13 75:7 76:23,25 77:11,14,23 78:9 82:7 83:17 87:5,17 89:1,17 90:11 94:18 94:23 97:21 100:1 100:18,23 101:18 101:22 102:23 103:23 104:4,11 106:14 107:19 108:22 112:4 113:19 114:2,23 115:18 118:7 126:15 130:8 131:19 141:3 142:4 142:5 144:15 145:3 146:9 147:3 148:3 150:13,21 151:9 152:7 153:18 154:10 156:11 162:22 164:2,11,20 165:22 167:17 182:25 188:10 197:25 198:14 199:13 sit 43:23 56:15 site 15:9,20,25 16:5 17:21,22 18:17 26:4 133:10,11 164:7 180:12 185:4,6,7,8 191:1,2 211:7,11 213:13 sites 166:6 188:7 sitting 56:1,5,11 57:15 59:2 65:19 82:19 123:4,10,10 124:11 128:6 129:11 172:8 179:25 184:8 199:25 situation 51:8 122:21	156:19 six 184:19 skill 215:16 Slovak 2:14 slower 145:9 small 12:1 48:25 151:5,7 smelter 29:5 smoke 92:20 93:11 smooth 182:24 sodium 39:2 sodium/potassium 170:16 171:16 175:8 soil 118:4,25 119:4,7 119:16,22 120:7,10 120:11,12,19,24,24 120:25 121:9,15,20 122:3,4,8,13,15,19 122:23,25 123:5,7 123:13 124:14,18 125:10 126:21 127:1,5,15,15,18 128:14,15,24 129:4 129:10,12,16 167:22 168:6,7,11 168:12 169:16 193:6 195:16,17 196:8 soils 119:6 125:6 126:24 128:20 somebody 24:7 99:20 135:13 191:24 somebody's 99:7 somewhat 90:8 91:13 93:2 158:21 sooner 41:23 sophisticated 112:1 sorry 13:8 24:2 29:16 29:23 41:11 74:2 129:7 130:21 132:9 138:1 142:18 sort 122:20 126:21 186:25 sound 53:3,18 sounds 53:19 198:16 source 18:9 92:17
---	--	--	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

111:11 114:21 115:7,20 123:11 124:12 126:12 181:16 192:12,15 sources 18:11,13 20:6 129:2 181:20 south 186:23 spaces 115:5 speak 9:13 32:8 96:23 102:21 116:6 116:6,10 129:9 134:5 180:1 185:22 speaking 9:14 17:15 19:6 43:3 50:12 113:21 114:3 126:24 160:16 168:21 speaks 101:20 102:22 102:25 104:3,7 109:11,15,20 110:2 110:16 111:9 113:24 114:7,10 Spear 1:17 5:3,18,21 6:1,5,15 7:22 8:7,16 27:4 66:5,6,21 75:3 77:10 78:7 130:2,5 130:17 134:9 138:23 163:24 197:1,5 210:24 211:1 214:21 215:10 216:1,25 species 183:21 184:7 184:10 186:16 specific 41:7 42:18 43:23 44:11 56:12 59:6 64:13 71:17 88:14 93:14 109:14 117:18 130:13 137:6 152:22 153:25 207:17 208:8 specifically 28:25 29:22 41:21 47:8 56:14 62:14 77:20 96:7 113:25 125:13 126:24 131:25 144:18	specifics 56:10 spectrum 180:11 speculating 193:13 speeds 91:9 spelled 102:4 spelling 26:6 spend 170:5 198:23 spent 152:12 Spokane 159:21,25 160:8 spot 183:11 Sprayed 115:15 spread 212:25 spring 12:6,7 69:1 square 176:2 177:7 178:13 203:7 ss 215:2 St 58:2,2 169:15 stack 79:24 103:1 193:21 198:19 stackers 194:5,16 202:12 stacking 209:1 stage 192:20 stagnant 94:8,13 stand 25:16 141:11 141:21 207:23 standard 113:16 134:3,15 standards 31:3 72:2 72:5,10 108:21 standing 198:6 standpoint 48:3 60:17 91:2 92:20 192:11 Stansbury 2:4 5:4,6 7:1,1,17,20 8:2,8 23:6,15 25:3 26:20 27:4 28:16 31:25 32:12 33:20 36:11 48:16 49:4,12,20 50:4 51:10 53:12 58:21 63:21 64:17 65:24 66:4,16,23 67:1,5,15 74:21,25 77:2,6 78:2 85:12 85:14 87:7,15 92:9	92:13 97:20 99:25 101:8,10 110:23 111:3,6,8,14,20 116:22,24 117:14 123:20 124:5,19 129:21 130:4 131:12 138:23 139:4,8,16,19 149:14 152:7 163:22 164:1 194:9 194:12,19 196:22 197:7,11,13 207:25 208:12,21,22 209:5 209:8,11 210:7,14 210:17 214:9,18 start 14:13 37:13 134:19 170:20 180:16 183:12 186:20 189:20 191:15 started 69:4 150:20 166:19 192:8 starting 140:14 185:18 state 6:8 48:18 49:5 82:23 101:15 102:1 105:19,24,25 106:1 113:22 140:19 142:10 143:3 213:25 215:1,7,22 stated 9:22 28:13 36:5 64:13 112:6 175:2 201:8 207:15 207:24 208:6 209:11 statement 48:22 49:15 91:12 126:8 153:20 164:11 189:7 statements 130:6 140:5 states 1:1 99:19 115:1 131:7 188:5 189:5 206:10 static 91:25 stating 207:7 station 176:23	stay 30:5 79:24,25 stayed 31:19 staying 187:22 stays 183:17 step 38:13 steps 99:21 stick 194:4 stir 18:6 stop 50:17 stops 50:9 stove 78:22 stoves 162:7 strategies 12:8 13:7,8 13:9,11 strategy 11:25 street 2:7 3:9,19 4:18 91:5 strike 36:25 49:15 51:24 61:23 62:11 63:16 69:8 80:10,23 122:8 143:13 154:17 strive 9:13 structures 203:7 student 183:24 students 12:12,24 13:20 201:25 studied 14:24 15:7 17:7 18:1,2 91:23 92:4 120:6,9 159:19 studies 20:5,6,9 23:23 29:19 31:9,11 31:24 43:13 45:4,23 54:10 58:16 60:10 60:13 73:23 84:24 84:25 85:7 88:22 93:16 100:5 103:18 110:9,11 111:18 113:12 118:11 119:25 124:15,20 124:23,24 125:3,13 125:20,25 128:22 134:1 138:4 148:8 148:24 149:3 153:15 174:14 182:6 188:6 211:1,2 211:5,10
--	--	---	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

study 19:25 20:2,3,10 20:13,25 23:2,14,22 24:23 29:21 43:16 43:17,17,17,24,25 44:2,8,13,14,14,15 44:16,19,25 46:3,8 46:10,21 47:10,13 47:14,16,21 48:8 49:25 51:22 53:4 60:13,16,23,25 62:6 62:17 79:22 84:7 90:22 100:12,16 105:19,20 106:1,10 106:13,19,23,23 110:25 118:11 127:21 132:10,11 132:14,20 135:24 138:18 142:17,19 142:24 148:20 154:20,25 165:24 166:12,14,22 174:16,19,22 191:19 192:9 197:23 199:11,16 207:11,12 210:16 211:14,17,17 studying 15:13 119:3 122:18 182:4 stuff 108:15 162:5 183:16 subject 32:5 86:7 208:3 submission 87:24 submitted 64:18 73:10 74:13 86:14 submitting 80:22 86:10 substance 136:6 137:3,21 138:11 substances 93:10 substantial 126:12 substantive 69:20 successor 141:19 succinctly 48:18 49:5 49:7 suggest 171:18 181:8 suggested 140:1	suggests 188:6 suit 165:13 Suite 3:9 4:8 suited 186:10 198:22 suits 198:24 Sullivan 43:14,16,24 51:11 110:12 155:19 156:2 summaries 31:10 summarize 42:6 48:14 70:6 summarizes 144:10 summary 58:17 summer 12:5 20:25 20:25 21:1,24 69:2 summers 51:19 summertime 198:23 support 38:4 47:17 48:9,12 49:25 82:3 174:19 supports 174:24 suppose 57:14 80:16 82:6 160:11 Supreme 109:25 sure 12:24 15:22 26:18 29:10,18,21 31:2,14 33:8,21 41:9 43:21 57:9,14 60:21 61:16,21 62:15 64:16 66:16 73:18 84:1 88:18 95:18 97:13 99:17 106:21 110:4 114:9 117:11 125:7 135:12 136:15 138:14 139:12 144:8,20,22 148:8 150:5,14,16,16,16 150:18 153:6 167:21,23 181:3,3,6 186:11 190:5 196:17 198:4 202:1 207:6 surface 21:19 121:2,4 121:13,23 122:1,10 182:21 183:14 surfaces 182:24	surrounding 15:25 159:25 165:21 167:15 191:23 surveillance 51:18,25 99:8 104:9 survey 29:15 159:24 suspect 146:15 Sutcliffe 3:17 swear 6:25 sworn 7:24 215:10 symptoms 115:9 system 167:24 168:4 systematically 91:23	79:2,5 89:11 124:23 213:8 talked 53:4 191:17 talking 33:23 34:2,4 36:21 37:15,15,16 38:14 40:5,6,22 41:17,20 44:16 46:18 50:13 74:13 83:3 96:4,18 102:19 114:14,15 118:19 121:5 123:16 125:19 126:17 127:1,20 138:3 147:21 149:16 153:25 161:1 168:24 173:23 189:15 191:17 192:2 198:17 202:25 204:10 205:8 209:19 talks 55:18 98:15 99:18 110:20 111:17 tape 66:20 130:1 196:23,24,25 197:4 Tara 77:10 task 193:22,24 tasks 119:2 193:17 202:15 taught 11:23 12:7 TDP 64:4,7 teach 11:22,24 12:6 13:19 201:24 teaching 11:19 12:12 14:2 Tech 8:15 10:3,13 11:8,12,16,19 13:23 14:2 73:2 122:15 technical 42:14 93:17 125:16 127:24 technology 12:1 78:8 134:19 Telephonically 3:4 3:14 4:4,13 tell 15:17 68:1 71:2 89:15 90:6 103:8 106:9 165:16 167:3
---	--	---	---

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

171:12 172:5 199:8 telling 99:21 tells 47:5 119:5 Telphonically 2:20 TEM 173:7 176:14 177:5 179:7 198:11 203:4,12 204:3,5,7 204:12,12,16 205:20,21 temperatures 91:10 ten 13:24 14:6,9 tend 90:10 94:4 122:8,9 tendency 121:12,14 121:19 tends 91:19,20 term 28:7 40:9 48:12 59:8,9 89:21 90:18 97:17 98:22,23,24 99:5,6 109:2,3 117:10 119:10 168:14 169:2 terms 24:9 119:6 133:4 138:3 149:25 156:20 161:12 169:24 171:10 177:6 183:2 205:25 206:18 Terry 1:17 5:3 6:1,5 6:14 7:22 8:7 66:6 66:21 75:3 77:9 78:7 130:2 197:1,5 214:21 215:9 216:1 216:25 test 24:19 102:19 testified 7:25 25:2 36:18 75:22,25 76:4 76:8 81:6 85:9 212:23 testify 31:23 36:7 42:9,21 76:17 209:10 testifying 23:4 74:9 80:23 testimony 58:18 63:19 65:20 68:8,16 76:19 84:20 101:3,7	123:25 124:3 208:3 208:19,24 209:14 209:23 212:24 testing 12:14 31:18 166:8 tests 52:12,15 95:5 167:7 Texas 3:10 textbooks 29:11 31:15 thank 101:8 117:12 137:1 197:12 203:15 thanks 210:20 theoretical 115:11 they'd 168:3 194:17 thickening 59:8,11 thin 36:22 205:18 thing 133:16 170:25 176:4 180:16 205:17 207:11 210:25 things 13:18 15:23 16:19 28:5 29:13 30:18 31:1 41:16 48:6 70:16 71:8 90:2 91:10 93:12,22 96:22 126:5,21 140:12 think 10:14 12:3 18:5 26:13 37:6 39:2 43:7 44:23 47:24 49:10,12 50:22 53:25 56:8,11 57:11 57:13 58:23 59:3 60:24 61:14 70:11 70:21 81:25 86:13 88:11,20 89:20 93:8 97:16,19 110:21 116:8,17,20 117:14 118:11,11 120:24 121:16 123:15,18 123:20 124:22 126:25 127:23 134:11 137:22 138:4,6 141:13 143:23 145:21	149:24 154:15 156:21 162:13 163:24 164:7 166:7 168:17 169:8 170:3 170:3 171:1,5,7,15 177:8 178:25 183:4 183:21 186:19,19 189:1 192:17 194:3 194:5,18 196:22 200:9,11 201:8 204:6 207:23 208:15 213:25 thinking 205:1 third 17:2 203:19 Thirty 120:19 Thomas 2:4,24 thought 41:12 thousands 91:6 169:5 threat 83:24 three 86:11 95:1 103:21 132:8,9 133:2 167:7,9 198:11,16 199:2 203:11 threw 53:14 throughout 7 165:20 tie 51:11 time 6:5,12 11:8 28:4 29:10 31:20 48:2 65:22 66:15,17,22 68:19 70:24 72:10 74:1 75:14,21,25 76:3,12 96:20 101:21 103:1 104:8 105:23 106:3 107:18 115:3 121:25 123:22 127:10,12 129:20 129:23 130:3,19 131:2 133:11 149:12,21 152:12 153:13 158:22 170:5 171:14 182:7 183:18 186:15 197:2,4 198:21,21 198:23,25 199:1 201:14,19 208:21	214:7,23 215:12 timeline 211:25 times 8:19 9:13 54:8 72:2 73:7 104:9 115:11 140:9 199:2 time-weighted 47:23 201:11,13,23 202:3 title 10:6,7 30:14 192:18 199:3 today 9:18 51:9 56:1 56:5,11,15 57:15 59:2 65:19 82:19 84:19 85:2,21 87:5 110:11 111:11 123:4,10 124:11 128:6 129:11 141:7 149:12 172:8 179:25 184:8 199:25 told 168:17 175:6 200:10 Tom 2:12 7:3 101:9 209:6 Tony 75:3 77:9 78:6 86:13 92:16 93:3 94:1,5 tools 25:24,25 top 167:14 193:14 topic 12:24 56:15 100:4 total 138:6,8 198:3,5 202:15 203:19 town 15:10 162:16 180:13 186:21 tox 111:17 toxic 40:19,21 110:1 111:10 133:23,23 toxicity 45:2 58:23 59:1 62:22 109:23 110:2,10,24,24 111:9,12,17,21 130:7,14 132:4 136:6,10,16 137:3,8 137:20 138:11,17 139:24 210:3 toxicological 32:3 110:9
--	--	---	---

toxicologist 32:4 40:17 112:9 130:10 135:19 209:25	166:9,9 174:11,22 174:23 175:1 177:18 180:11	Turbulence 115:13	186:20 188:12 191:16
toxicology 29:13 112:13 130:16 135:21	183:18,20 186:6,23 187:11 188:6,16 189:17,24 190:2	turn 96:3 141:23 197:9 198:10	understandable 49:18
track 178:11 188:24 189:16,17	191:15 193:10 195:1 198:2,4,5,7,8 198:18 199:1	TWA 141:2 202:3,3 203:4 204:3	understanding 23:19 27:7 29:1 39:1 42:7 46:8 50:8 51:7 56:2 56:13 62:9 96:8 109:12 110:10,17 110:18,21 112:17 113:1,5 116:1,19 118:18 145:19 200:7,8
trail 24:17 25:10	207:13	twice 214:18	understood 9:23 26:19 128:16 163:24
trails 25:11	tremolite 36:20,21 37:20 38:20,24 39:6 39:13,25 110:9,11 111:10,21 112:3 131:15	two 13:21 33:18 70:11,13 73:2 184:19 187:24 193:23 194:14 203:11,22 215:14	undertaking 192:16
trained 57:21	trial 68:22 69:16 70:9 76:13 101:7 198:20 198:24 199:2	type 14:23 27:25 35:14 37:4,14 69:23 91:24 92:21 137:7 166:9 177:9,11 179:4 192:5	under-counted 139:21
training 12:15 32:13 32:15,18 40:25 41:3 41:5 57:12,16 68:7 119:3	trials 198:12,17	types 12:14 16:18 17:11 31:10 34:3,22 35:25 41:24 45:5 54:9 60:13,14 125:6 126:5 148:14 159:2 177:14,15 191:7 204:16	unexpanded 157:8 161:5,8,11,19 162:1 162:9,11,19,21,23 163:7 189:10,21 190:7,10,13
transcribed 215:14	tried 174:13 179:2 186:8,8,13,15 193:16	typically 90:21 135:4 143:17	unintelligible 28:12
transcript 101:4	trips 11:15,17	Tyvek 21:7	Uninterrupted 10:15
transferred 16:22 181:2	truck 16:19,20,23		unique 50:10
transition 148:13	true 82:8 205:13 213:13,14 215:15	U	United 1:1 131:7 188:5 189:5
translates 172:22 176:1	trust 63:25	ultimately 19:19 106:16 108:8 116:6	units 162:24
transmission 171:11	truthfully 9:19	um-hmm 9:10 125:2 144:14	University 8:15 10:4 10:20 11:1,2,5,11 19:1,7,11,12,24 20:2 67:23 84:8
transport 18:21	try 38:22 81:21 93:19 125:5 139:16 143:17 144:5 148:17 180:23 186:15 201:24	uncomfortable 133:24	unloading 16:23 17:2 17:23
transportation 15:10 16:6,7,12,14,17 17:1,22 188:3 189:3	trying 14:5 15:16 16:24 26:23 78:15 79:14 98:13 99:15 108:14 116:13 120:24 121:25 126:2 128:9 134:18 147:19 149:10,24 150:1,2 153:5 156:22 162:25 166:7,19 172:5 174:14 180:15 187:14,16,21 191:8 192:11,24	underestimating 151:20	unpack 12:4 36:2
transported 162:15 190:9	Tucker 131:17	undergraduate 13:19	unpublished 155:14
trapped 174:21		underlying 142:24	unreliable 148:17,19 148:23 149:25
travel 114:21 115:23		understand 9:25 17:13 28:3 33:9 40:10 47:6 48:23 53:8 73:6 76:19 97:20 99:25 116:17 123:3 135:20 138:13,14,24 139:13 176:18 179:10 180:25	unsettles 16:9
traveled 11:17 174:25			unsupportable 140:7
traveling 16:4 17:20			untrue 213:13
travels 164:16			updated 73:13
treated 64:7			upright 195:1
tree 13:3 24:18,19 25:13 75:11,12 166:9 167:14,19,22 167:23,25 172:13 175:19 177:15 181:5,8,20 184:2,2 184:7,10,11,12 186:16 190:3 193:19 194:20,21 195:15 196:6			USA 77:9
trees 5:18 25:16 75:1			use 28:7 40:9 67:11

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

67:12,12 98:13,23 98:24 99:5 114:12 138:10 143:14,25 148:5 149:9,22,24 150:1,2 169:2 173:6 179:5 189:14 204:2 204:3 Usually 177:5 Utah 19:12,24 20:2 84:9 U.S 68:19,23 69:10 71:18 72:25 74:1,10 75:15 76:13 81:3 86:20 115:16	181:21,25 182:1,8 188:4,7,13 189:4,11 189:21 190:7,10,13 196:1 197:16 versus 33:23 204:12 VI 154:9 videographer 4:24 6:12,23 66:17,20 129:23 130:1 196:25 197:4 214:15,20 Videotape 5:8,9,10 5:11 videotaped 1:17 6:14 66:21 130:2 197:1,5 214:21 violations 108:20 virtues 154:24 Vitae 5:16,17 volume 179:9 Vorwald 110:6,7,8 111:17	164:23 167:21 180:16 185:19 192:10 Ward 75:3 77:9 78:6 86:13 92:17 94:1 Ward's 93:3 94:5 warn 100:12,16 warning 102:9 Washington 2:8,25 3:20 4:9 wasn't 71:5 79:21 81:11,11 84:11 85:17 153:3 195:18 watch 162:7 way 15:12,21,25 16:9 17:2 18:11 20:17 23:23 37:21 40:15 44:2 56:2,6,12 72:7 90:2 96:22 97:3,4,5 98:22 99:19 101:11 109:14 116:2 117:18 118:23 134:4 137:7 139:17 152:23 166:2 170:19 171:24 180:1 181:23 183:5 183:16 185:9,20 186:21 ways 94:20 164:12 168:18 wear 12:15 wearing 21:7 165:13 weather 37:8 42:19 web 185:4,5,7,8 211:7,11 Webber 75:6 78:7 177:20 WEDNESDAY 6:2 weight 60:22,25 weighted 152:11 Weis 126:4,6 127:6 128:21 well-done 60:24 went 11:14 46:14 151:23 weren't 57:23 58:1,5 95:12 151:22	wet 144:18,25 146:6 we'll 16:8 51:10 196:24 we're 6:12 10:1 12:5 13:17 15:15 20:9 38:14 40:5,6 41:9 44:16 45:3 48:6 52:21 66:14,17,22 67:11,11,12 74:12 74:13 75:1 84:5 91:8 96:18 99:17 103:15 107:15 110:23 113:21 114:14,15 118:19 121:22,23,25 125:18 126:6 129:23 130:3 134:18 135:12 136:15 147:16,19 147:21 148:11 149:14,16,21 152:8 153:22 160:13 161:1 169:1 174:14 189:15 192:1 193:13 197:2,6 202:25 204:10 205:19 214:24 we've 14:8 15:8 19:16 26:8,11 27:6 119:5,7 122:15 128:21 134:22 166:6,10,11 171:14 171:17 174:13 188:19 191:10 200:25 204:17 212:4,4 Wheeler 131:16 WHEREOF 215:17 Whitehouse 55:21 56:16 103:19 104:2 Whitehouse's 43:15 43:18 55:5,16 widespread 102:2 willing 70:10 88:17 174:9 Wilmington 4:19 winchite 38:19,24
<hr/> V <hr/> v 4:5 101:4 148:1 vague 27:1 33:13,16 97:17,19 139:2 vaguely 143:11 valley 90:8,8 91:12 91:20 value 65:3 values 144:11 variability 171:1,6 variable 177:15 variables 146:16 variety 68:3 various 35:4 60:20 72:2 73:22 95:5 143:5 158:19 159:17 167:7 vermiculite 5:22 14:18,20,21,23,25 15:1,3 17:12,14,23 71:23 117:23 121:24 126:11 131:15 155:11,16 156:10,16 157:8,11 157:14,15,23 158:20 159:6 160:13,21 161:5,8 161:11,13,20,22,24 162:3,11,20,24 163:7 168:23 170:9 180:23 181:1,4,7,11 181:13,14,16,19,20	<hr/> W <hr/> wait 22:25 walk 88:12,17 140:13 164:22 165:3 180:19 194:16 walked 153:1 walking 25:15,16 194:17,23 195:17 195:18 wall 15:2,2 walls 15:4 17:17 wandering 165:10 want 22:25 41:9 48:21 68:15 82:22 91:9 98:13,24 99:16 116:16 118:15 120:23 136:12 144:17 150:14 177:6 202:1 204:1 207:6,23 210:25 213:12 wanted 40:24 41:18 62:5 73:18 83:18,19 84:16 137:8 140:13		

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

39:10,19,21,24 112:2 wind 90:9 91:9,9 94:4 windblown 18:14 winter 69:1 wintertime 91:17 wipe 21:6,16,18,19 21:20,23 22:7,8,10 195:10 198:11 wipes 22:9,9 wiping 21:19 wish 87:25 Wisler 4:14 7:18,18 withdraw 211:16 witness 5:2 6:25 7:23 23:7,9 26:16,21,22 28:14 30:23 31:22 33:15,18 48:19 49:3 49:10,17 50:2 51:6 53:10 63:18 68:8,15 68:18 70:11 71:11 92:5,11 97:18 101:6 111:16 116:19 123:16,21 124:15 139:5,6,7 194:16 210:14 215:9,16,17 witness's 26:18 wood 78:12,15 79:23 83:19 92:20 93:11 180:3,12 191:12 192:13 194:14 198:19 209:1 woods 82:20 word 28:17 33:13 94:9 99:16 100:5 183:25 189:14 195:19 words 92:18 98:13 120:23 134:17 171:2 work 8:14 12:23 13:23 14:6,10,12,12 14:13 19:4,12,14,14 19:19 20:16 22:12 22:13,15 23:9,12 24:3,4,13,14,16 35:18 42:13,13	57:13 61:4 69:5 70:23,25 81:23,25 84:17,18 87:23 93:3 93:5 94:5,6 120:25 120:25 122:2,17,18 123:5,8 126:19 143:18,20 148:9 153:16 159:21,22 160:12 166:19,20 170:18 171:3 177:16 186:10 187:7 188:19 192:7 198:22 207:12 212:2,5 worked 10:12 14:14 44:9 58:1 73:3 86:16 139:23 160:3 185:20 192:4 207:18 208:9 worker 72:15 132:21 152:12 workers 12:15 20:12 23:25 30:25 44:9,16 45:15 100:13,14,16 100:22 105:19 106:11 108:19,19 115:9 126:14 144:2 151:8,14,22,23 152:2,13,18 158:4 158:13 161:17,17 working 11:7 19:16 23:25 29:5 46:19 48:1,2 50:15 54:6 61:14,20 72:17 74:1 75:15 76:12 86:16 86:19 114:5 117:5 120:6 125:6 131:1 132:17 138:15 139:14,20 160:14 212:4 workplace 13:11 61:19 72:7 works 56:25 183:16 worse 206:16 worst 194:18 206:12 worst-case 199:12 205:24 206:10	wouldn't 91:2 122:11 148:10 181:22 204:20 213:3 wrinkles 182:23 write 20:1 writing 74:5 written 71:20,22 wrong 55:19 172:12 178:9 wrote 131:2 W.R 1:7 6:17 7:2 8:9 72:9,14 75:19 76:14 96:12,19 100:15 101:4 133:8 214:22 216:3 <hr/> X X 5:1,14 129:16 136:9 x-ray 51:23 52:6 x-rays 52:8 53:17 <hr/> Y Y 129:17 yeah 10:16 13:14 16:14 23:9 28:14 30:23 32:2 33:22 52:21 58:22 61:4 67:1,11 69:23 75:5 78:14 83:18 89:18 93:4 95:22 100:7 105:7 110:6 111:3 111:16 118:1 119:7 125:15 126:3 129:21 130:22 133:21 141:15 152:24 154:1 162:10 163:21 167:9 168:12 170:3 173:6,22 177:4 178:17,25 179:14 179:21 181:15,18 191:10,12 193:16 195:22 197:23 200:11 203:25 206:7,23 208:13 210:19	year 144:12 156:24 156:24 years 10:13 11:23 13:24 14:6,9 19:13 19:15 26:18 30:3 46:12,14 50:16 58:2 61:5 68:7 98:5 101:16 114:17 115:21 116:3 120:16,19 128:19 165:20 166:4,4 169:5 York 175:18 176:20 177:2 188:20 <hr/> Z Zolnikov 77:10 zone 21:12,15,23 26:4 83:21 195:13 197:16 198:13 199:5 200:5,23 214:12 zones 195:8 Zonolite 17:16,24 18:8 96:13,19 100:15 159:12 <hr/> \$ \$150 71:16 85:4 <hr/> 0 0 165:20 0.07 202:12 0.1 134:15 147:20 173:8 0.11 206:1 0.12 202:12 0.13 178:11,16 179:18 0.25 178:12 205:18 0.26 202:10 0.29 202:15 0.3 47:24 0.4 47:24 0.5 47:24 147:20 0.67 103:21 0.72 202:6
--	--	---	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

0.8 144:19 145:3,12 01-01139 1:7 6:17 03 70:25 09 6:2 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 5:8,16 66:1,3,6 67:2 67:9,9,10 72:15 88:19 118:15,19,21 125:11 164:4,6,22 165:3,10 167:8,9 172:11,14,19 177:7 180:11,18 197:13 200:16,19 213:10 1A 172:14 1% 118:5 1,186 53:20 1,214 145:5 1.1 103:22 1.2 176:23 1.5 103:22 197:18 213:25 1:07 197:2 1:17 197:4 1:37 214:23 10 94:19 95:2 153:7 177:1,23 186:23 100 147:13 172:22 11 1:5 94:20 95:2 11% 112:2 11:08 129:23 11:47 130:3 1107 4:18 1152 3:19 119 102:5 12 95:5 1200 4:8 13 96:3,4 99:18 100:8 100:9 130 5:10 131 5:22 14 100:9 1401 3:9 15 100:25 101:6,10 215:24 15th 3:19 16 101:24	17 52:19,25 102:15 102:17 1734 1:22 6:20 1747 4:8 18 103:7 114:16 19 104:6 114:16 175:23 176:18 179:16 1942 140:17 1950-1990 103:11 1951 111:18 1956 110:1 142:10 1960s 113:11,22 1962 144:12 1964 102:1 1965 103:12 148:25 1966 101:17 1967 102:18 140:20 142:6 144:12 149:15 1968 102:5 140:17 150:11 151:5 153:11,24 1969 140:18 142:10 146:21,23 197 5:11 1970 142:13 1971 142:3 1974 140:24 1975 103:20 1976 145:7 146:6 1978 28:21 115:17,22 1979 29:3,20,21,23 30:1,6,9 1980 106:10 1981 142:3 1982 142:14 1987 103:18 130:18 131:17 19899 4:19 1990 104:10 1996 11:6 156:19 1999 125:19,24 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 5:9,17 66:20,24 67:4,7 88:20 140:14	163:17,18,23 164:10,13,22 165:4 165:10,14 180:18 183:9 198:10 20 6:2 61:4 68:7 103:17 104:1,13 115:13 120:16 141:1 166:3 20-something 46:14 2000 51:19 2000s 76:3,8 20005 2:8,25 3:20 20006-4604 4:9 2001 51:19 129:6 2003 14:9 18:25 19:2 19:7 2004 55:9,14,18,21 56:1,5,16 129:6 2005 68:25 69:4 70:3 73:14 127:24 2006 73:14 74:13,16 75:2 79:9 80:20,25 85:8 127:24 163:16 171:23 197:14 2007 20:3 44:23 76:22 77:14 78:23 80:5,21 81:1 82:2 84:4,7 85:8 155:22 174:16 2008 5:16 21:25 44:23 55:11 66:7 73:15 76:7,8 81:12 86:3 155:22 211:19 2009 1:24 5:17 6:20 67:7,10 73:15 77:22 77:23 78:8 79:5,19 80:21 81:1,2,13 85:8 86:1 89:4 209:12 214:23 215:19 216:2 2011 215:24 21 104:16 210 5:5 214 5:6 215:15 22 104:19 23 104:22 2325 2:15	24 104:25 25 105:18 26 10:13 46:15 105:25 27 88:3 95:6,25 106:5 106:8 28 107:3,6 29 1:24 6:2,19 107:7 214:23 216:2 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 5:10,18 54:8 74:24 79:8 80:20,25 88:20 88:25 115:12 130:1 141:24 163:17 164:18 165:6,7 167:5 196:25 201:3 3,279 142:14 30 8:22 61:4 107:10 115:21 120:18 31 107:21 116:2 32 88:4 107:24 33 108:2,3 336 140:18 142:9 34 108:16 35 109:10 36 109:20 110:4 37 112:15 164:19 184:21 197:17 214:2 38 112:21 39 112:25 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 5:11,19 46:15 77:5 77:7 78:24 80:5,21 81:1 83:13,14 84:7 88:21,25 89:1 115:12 144:9 175:15 176:5 178:22 190:16 197:5,8 213:7 4's 177:24 40 95:6,25 113:4,9 166:4 198:25,25 41 113:24 4116 140:20
---	--	--	--

W.R. GRACE & CO.

TERRY M. SPEAR, Ph.D.

July 29, 2009

42 114:6,19	69 149:15		
43 116:9,25			
44 117:14	<hr/> 7 <hr/>		
45 117:21	7 5:22 89:14,22		
46 118:3 129:8	101:11 131:11,14		
461 163:23 165:14	131:14 178:10,16		
462 167:5	178:22 179:17		
4620 3:9	210:18,19		
464 182:18 187:22	70 22:10 149:15		
48 126:4,7	70s 31:7 205:9		
	719 197:9 213:10		
<hr/> 5 <hr/>	720 200:20		
5 5:20 78:1,4,5 80:21	721 198:11		
81:1,13 88:21 89:1	722 199:7		
89:4 103:14 133:13	74 5:18		
133:19,22 134:2,6	75201 3:10		
134:25 135:3,13,14	76 144:18 145:1,1		
138:16 139:22	77 5:19,20		
140:5 145:8 146:9	789 142:3		
173:1,5,10,10,14,20	79 103:13		
175:21 176:5,23			
177:12 186:23	<hr/> 8 <hr/>		
196:22 203:13,16	8 5:4 90:6 101:11		
204:4 206:2	180:3		
5.8 176:1	8-hr 141:2		
50 22:6 68:9	8:32 6:12		
50-or-so 9:1	8:35 1:25		
52 130:5,6	80 39:18 115:13		
53 102:3 130:6	80s 11:14 44:20		
530 172:16	205:9		
59403-2325 2:16	84% 112:2		
	87 5:21		
<hr/> 6 <hr/>			
6 5:8,21 39:13 87:12	<hr/> 9 <hr/>		
87:16 89:13,14,22	9 94:18,19,19 95:2		
147:25 150:9	9,000-something		
184:17	53:5		
6% 112:3	9:43 66:17		
6.7 54:8	9:49 66:22		
60 22:10 171:16	90s 125:4		
60s 205:8	99 125:22		
600 102:20			
655 2:7			
66 5:9,16			
6600 53:17			
67 5:17			
68 142:6 205:7			